PROPERTY OF
PRINCETON
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY.

Division BS2555
Section .4.W52
No. 1866

INTRODUCTION

TO THE

STUDY OF THE GOSPELS.

WITH

HISTORICAL AND EXPLANATORY NOTES.

BY

BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, M.A.
FORMERLY FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE; AUTHOR OF A "HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON," ETC.

WITH

An Introduction

BY

HORATIO B. HACKETT, D.D.
PROFESSOR IN NEWTON THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION; AUTHOR OF "A COMMENTARY ON THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES," "ILLUSTRATIONS OF SCRIPTURE," ETC.

BOSTON:
GOULD AND LINCOLN,
59 WASHINGTON STREET.
NEW YORK: SHELDON AND COMPANY.
CINCINNATI: GEORGE S. BLANCHARD.
1866.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1862, by
GOULD AND LINCOLN,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

To my Father.

Εὐλόγως ὁ διδάσκαλος ἡμῶν ἔλεγεν·

ΓΙΝΕΣΘΕ ΤΡΑΠΕΖΙΤΑΙ ΔΟΚΙΜΟΙ.

INTRODUCTION

TO

THE AMERICAN EDITION.

Mr. Westcott, the author of the volume which the American publishers have here reprinted, was formerly a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and is now one of the Masters in Harrow School. He enjoys a high reputation in his own country as a scholar and a theologian, and is held to be a writer of acknowledged authority on the subjects which he has brought within the circle of his studies. His work on the *Canon of the New Testament* is well known, on this side of the Atlantic as well as abroad, as a performance of great learning and ability. Some of the more elaborate articles in Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* are from his pen. This *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, his latest work, was published during the last year, and has been received with marked favor in England. Competent judges in this country who have examined the treatise agree in their estimate of its value to the cause of sacred learning. It was found that different persons were so much impressed with its merit and its adaptation to meet a palpable want of the times, that they had been led, without concert with each other, to adopt measures to reissue the volume here, and thus render it more accessible to the American public.

Perhaps I cannot better accomplish the object of these introductory words, than by alluding briefly to some of the characteristics of the work which deserve attention. It must be an imperfect

sketch; for a careful study of the treatise itself is necessary to give the reader any idea of its character that would be just to the author.

In all ages of the church the Gospels, which describe the life and record the teachings of the Saviour, have been regarded by believers as the primary source of their faith and hopes, and by skeptics as the ground on which they could most effectually assail the claims of Christianity and of the sacred writings to a divine origin. The peculiar character of the Gospel narratives, as separate and independent histories, has enabled objectors to compare them with each other, and to point out variations which they allege to be contradictory, and hence subversive of the historical credibility of the Evangelists. Porphyry in the third century had already taken the position, in this respect, which Strauss and his followers occupy at the present day. It must be confessed that the friends of the truth have often set forth views of the Gospels as historical compositions, have prescribed to the writers of them an order of narration, and made them subject to assumed laws of inspiration, with which it is not easy to reconcile the facts of the case; and opponents have thus been able to show that, according to such standards of judgment, the Gospels do not answer to the character which is claimed for them. No small degree of ignorance respecting what the Evangelists have done and proposed to do, as ascertained from the actual contents and structure of the histories, has been shown on both sides of this controversy. The chief object of the present work is to present to us the results of a critical and comprehensive examination of the Gospels, for the purpose of settling the principles which distinguish them from other writings, the points of agreement and disagreement which exist between them, the plan on which they are composed, the peculiar traits of the several writers as individuals, their diverse training, mental habits, differences of style; and thus, by means of the apparent contrariety itself, establishing their character of essential unity, and of harmony both with the truth and with one another. Such a vindication of these

Scriptures is essential to their authority as truthful records, and preliminary, therefore, to a proper use of them as a source of religious instruction and discipline. Hence it will be seen with what significant propriety this book, which is founded to such an extent on a study of the Gospels, has been entitled an "Introduction to the Study of the Gospels."

But the accomplishment of this more immediate object requires the author to introduce other related topics of great importance in the study of the New Testament. The Saviour performed his earthly work among the Jews; and the system of truth which his teachings perfected passed through the Jewish mind to the rest of the human family. It becomes, therefore, an interesting inquiry what was the process of intellectual and moral education which adapted this remarkable people to be the instructors of mankind; and, in order to comprehend fully the scheme of revelation, we must view the inspired writers in their connection with the manifold national influences which wrought out the Jewish type of faith and character, as it appeared at length in its completed form in the first promulgators of Christianity. The chapter on the *Preparation for the Gospel* is designed to supply this information. It enables us to see how God from the first had been arranging all the antecedents of the chosen race, to fit them to be the medium through which his final and highest revelations of truth were to be made to Jews and Gentiles. It is shown that the bondage in Egypt, the Assyrian captivity, the Persian rule, the Maccabæan dynasty, the contact with Greeks and Romans, as well as the numerous changes which took place in the inner life of the nation, all served to bring forward "the fulness of the times," and to discipline the people for the advent of Christ. The development of this train of thought will be found to be original and instructive. The section on the *Jewish Idea of the Messiah*, as presented in the Bible and other writings, is an admirable summary of the most reliable results of the researches of scholars on this subject, so vitally connected with the interpretation of the Scriptures. The account of the *Apocryphal*

Gospels is necessarily brief; but furnishes ample means for answering the important questions which arise out of the known existence of such Gospels, for which some in early times claimed a high place as a source of traditionary and supplementary knowledge respecting the Saviour's history. Though the author's plan does not require a formal exegesis of extended portions of the text, the reader will meet here with the exposition of many single passages, and with forms of translation which show the hand of a master in philology. The distribution of the miracles and parables of our Lord into different classes according to the moral ends or the aspects of religious truth which they were designed to confirm or illustrate, evinces a rare power of analysis, and will be useful to the preacher for homiletic purposes.

It is an important feature of the work, that, though it is intended specially to refute the form of skepticism represented, for example, by Strauss in Germany, and by Theodore Parker in this country, it is not directly polemic in its character, but treats of facts and discusses principles which render the argument appropriate to all times and places. The author seeks to accomplish his object by a negative process rather than a positive, by instruction and not by controversy. He is not so anxious to overwhelm the error, as to remove the ignorance and correct the misstatements out of which the error has arisen.

A work so distinguished by its ample learning, its thorough criticism, its calm and philosophical spirit, its vigorous and polished style, must challenge the respect of every class of readers, whatever may be their claims as scholars or their particular belief on the subjects here brought under review. At the same time, it is gratifying to see the evidence everywhere apparent of the author's convictions as a devout Christian, and a firm believer in the authority and inspiration of the Sacred Word. A tone of hearty confidence in the Scriptures, as true and the source of truth, pervades the work. Though the discussions are necessarily critical in their character, and afford but little room for the direct exhibition of

personal feeling, they show at every step the unobtrusive influence of an earnest faith, and a desire, as the predominant aim, to convince the understanding for the sake of the conscience and the heart.

The writer's experience as a teacher of biblical exegesis has led him to think, that there is no portion of the New Testament on which it is so difficult to give to the instruction imparted a character of unity and completeness, as the Gospels. The subject has, no doubt, its intrinsic difficulties, which no labor can wholly overcome. The time usually devoted to this part of the course of study is and must be disproportionate to the amount of work to be performed. It is possible to read and compare the different narratives only in some of the more important sections. Very few are able, in such a rapid survey of the ground, to lay up in their minds a connected view of the events of the Saviour's life. The impression of his character as unfolded in his works is liable to be indistinct and confused. Numberless questions respecting the plan of the Evangelists and the mode of reconciling them with each other have been thrust on the student, of which he has obtained no adequate solution. The use of the "Harmony," so called, may have thrown light upon many passages; but it will not be strange if it has disclosed almost as many perplexities as it has served to clear up. Every teacher must feel that a chief obstacle in the way of greater success here has been the want of suitable manuals or text-books of instruction, to be placed in the hands of students as an accompaniment of the ordinary lectures and oral teaching. We are confident that this work of Mr. Westcott will do much to supply this deficiency. It will not be amiss to say, that we welcome as another important aid of this nature the recently published "Lectures on the Life of Christ," by Professor Ellicott.[1] Such additions to our means of critical study invest the writings

1 Historical Lectures on the Life of our Lord Jesus Christ. With Notes, Critical, Historical, and Explanatory. By C. J. Ellicott, B. D. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. 1861.

of the Evangelists with new interest, and place the student of the Bible in a new condition for the useful and the more nearly exhaustive study of these first sources of Christian truth.[1]

The work has been reprinted in strict conformity with the English edition, except a few changes in the mode of designating the divisions, which consistency of plan and distinctness seemed to require. Pains have been taken to secure accuracy in the numerous proper names, titles of books, extracts from foreign languages, and similar details, so important in a learned treatise of this character. Mr. Westcott, who has been consulted in reference to the republication here, has forwarded some additions and corrections, which have been inserted in accordance with his wishes; and in this respect it may be claimed that this edition has some superiority to the original English edition.

It is a matter of gratitude that such a book has been written. It is hoped that it will recieve the attention from theological teachers, theological students, clergymen, and thoughtful readers of every class, to which its claims entitle it. The writer believes that many will join their prayers with his that God would be pleased to bless this endeavor to "convince gainsayers," and to lead believers to a larger measure of the "full assurance of faith and understanding" in the word and work of the Divine Redeemer.

1 The object here is not criticism, and this general commendation will not be understood to imply an assent to all the views and principles which the eminent writers referred to entertain.

H. B. H.

Newton Centre, April, 1861.

PREFACE.[1]

In the present work I have endeavored to define and fill up the outline which I sketched in "The Elements of the Gospel Harmony," published in 1851. The kindness with which that Essay was received encouraged me to work on with patience within the limits which I had marked out, in the hope that I might justify in some degree the friendly welcome of my critics. The experience of nine years has made me feel how much there was to remodel and correct and explain in the first rough draught, so that I have retained scarcely a paragraph in the form in which it was originally written.

The title of the book will explain the chief aim which I have had in view. It is intended to be an Introduction to the *Study* of the Gospels. I have therefore confined myself in many cases to the mere indication of lines of thought and inquiry, from the conviction that truth is felt to be more precious in proportion as it is opened to us by our own work. From this cause a combination of references to passages of

1 A few sentences have been dropped here from the Prefaces in the English edition, inasmuch as they relate chiefly to local or personal explanations.

Scripture often stands for the argument which it suggests, and claims are made upon the reader's attention which would be unreasonable if he were not regarded as a fellow-student with the writer. For the same reason I have carefully avoided the multiplication of references, confining myself to the acknowledgment of personal debts or to the indication of sources of further information.

My chief object has been to show that there is a true mean between the idea of a formal harmonization of the Gospels and the abandonment of their absolute truth. It was certainly an error of the earlier Harmonists that they endeavored to fit together the mere facts of the Gospels by mechanical ingenuity; but it is surely no less an error, in modern critics, that they hold the perfect truthfulness of Scripture as a matter of secondary moment. The more carefully we study the details of the Bible, the more fully shall we realize their importance; and daily experience can furnish parallels to the most intricate conjectures of commentators, who were wrong only so far as they attempted to determine the exact solution of a difficulty, when they should have been contented to wait in patience for a fuller knowledge.

Again: it must have occurred to every student of the Gospels that it cannot be sufficient to consider them separately. We must notice their mutual relations and constructive force. We must collect all their teaching into a great spiritual whole, and not rest satisfied with forming out of them an accurate, or even a plausible history. The general schemes which I have attempted to give of the miracles and parables will probably be so far satisfactory as to direct some attention to the wonderful harmonies which yet lie beneath the simplicity of Scripture.

Once again: it seems to be a general opinion that the Bible and the Church — Scripture and Tradition — are antithetical in some other way than as uniting to form the foundation of Christianity. I trust that the history of Inspiration which I have appended to this Essay may serve, in some measure, to remove an error which endangers the very existence of all Christian Communions.

The quotations which occur from time to time, I need hardly say, are derived from the original sources; and I trust that I have carefully acknowledged my obligations to others. In the history of Inspiration I could have wished to have found more trustworthy guides. Rosenmüller and Sonntag are partial and inexact, and Hagenbach is necessarily meagre. Every one, however, who has paid any attention to Patristic literature, will heartily acknowledge the deep debt of gratitude which he owes to the Benedictines of St. Maur.

In a subject which involves so vast a literature much must have been overlooked; but I have made it a point at least to study the researches of the great writers, and consciously to neglect none. My obligations to the leaders of the extreme German schools are very considerable, though I can rarely accept any of their conclusions. But criticism even without reverence may lay open mysteries for devout study.

On one question alone I have endeavored to preserve a complete independence. With one exception I have carefully abstained from reading anything which has been written on the subject of Inspiration since my first Essay was published. It seemed to me that it might be a more useful task to offer the simple result of personal thought and conviction than to attempt within narrow limits to discuss a subject which is

really infinite. At times independence is not dearly purchased by isolation; and one who speaks directly from his own heart on the highest truths, may suggest, even by the most imperfect utterance, something fresh or serviceable. Above all things, in this and other points of controversy, we cannot remind ourselves too often that arguments are strong only as they are true, and that truth is itself the fullest confutation of error.

How impossible it is to avoid errors in travelling over so wide a field, those will best know who have labored in it; and those who detect most easily the errors, from which I cannot hope to be free, will, I believe, be most ready to pardon them. But besides the fear of errors in detail, there is another consideration which must be deeply felt by every one who writes on Holy Scripture. The infinite greatness of the subject imparts an influence for good or for evil to all that bears upon it. The "winged word" leaves its trace, though the first effect may be, in the old Hebrew image, transient as the shadow of a flying bird. Yet I would humbly pray that by His blessing, who is perfect Wisdom and perfect Light, what has been written with candor and reverence may contribute, however little, to further the cause of Truth and Faith, the twin messengers of earth and heaven. IN HIS HAND ARE BOTH WE AND OUR WORDS.

B. F. W.

HARROW, LENT, 1860.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

PAGE

The connection of Philosophy and Religion in regard to the progressive development and the essential need of revelation; and the special objections brought against it, ... 27—29

The general effects of the course of Modern Philosophy on the popular views of Christianity, and Holy Scripture specially, as regards,

I. Its INSPIRATION. II. Its COMPLETENESS. III. Its INTERPRETATION, 30

I. INSPIRATION.

The contrast of the Calvinistic and Modern views — General objections to both — The possibility of a mean, ... 31—33

1. THE GENERAL IDEA OF INSPIRATION.

Compared with Revelation — Believed in universally — Involves no *special* difficulties incapable of analysis, . . 34—36

2. THE FORM OF INSPIRATION.

Pagan — Biblical — Various, yet always *twofold*, . . . 36—38

The personality of the teacher preserved — This is an essential part of the conception, the expression, the *record*, . 39, 40

Thus the inspiration of Scripture is plenary, and yet progressive, ... 41

3. THE RELATION OF INSPIRED WRITINGS TO CHRISTIAN LIFE, 42, 43

PAGE

4. The Proofs of the Inspiration of Writings.

(*a*) *External.*

i. Supernatural commission of Apostles.

ii. Analogy of Apostolic use of Old Testament.

iii. Testimony of the Church, ... 43, 44

(*b*) *Internal.*

How far a proof is possible, ... 44, 45
e. g., Gospels.

i. Negative Character — Fragmentary: Unchronological: Simple, ... 46, 47

ii. Subject, ... 48

iii. Social teaching — Miracles: Parables: Prophecies, . 49—53

II. COMPLETENESS.

Difficulties — Analogous to those in Individual: Society: Nature — Their solution to be found in the idea of Providence — History and Criticism suggest the idea of completeness, or at least a tendency towards it, ... 53—59

III. INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE TWOFOLD:

1. Literal.

Strictly grammatical: importance of this in New Testament — Objections met, ... 59—63

2. Spiritual.

Flows from literal: sanctioned by universal testimony.
The spiritual sense the *primary* sense, ... 65
Interpretation realized in the visible Church, . . . 65

The Province of Criticism, ... 65, 66

General Plan, ... 66, 67

CHAPTER I.

THE PREPARATION FOR THE GOSPEL.

PAGE

The true idea of History — The coming of Christ the centre of human history, and the record of the Gospel impressed with results of a world-wide training, the outlines of which are

I. Partly Preserved in the Old Testament, and

II. Partly to be sought in the Post-biblical History of the Jews, which is pregnant with important issues, both from outward vicissitudes and inward revolutions, during the (1) Persian and (2) Grecian periods; and here especially the foundations of Christian thought and writing were laid silently and slowly, ... 68—74

1. The Persian Period; as to

(*a*) *National hopes.*

The loss of independence gave to the Jews a truer spiritual union, and higher aspirations, . . . 74, 75

(*b*) *Spiritual position.*

As a consequence the prophetic work ceased, and the Scriptures were collected — Meanwhile religion assumed a more spiritual character, and the view of the spiritual world was widened, ... 76—78

(*c*) *Social organization.*

The hierarchical element prevailed from the growing regard to the Law and the Synagogue-service, . 78, 79

The dangers of the period — Its character impressed on the literature and traditions of the time, ... 80—82

2. The Grecian Period.

The Dispersion, military and commercial, reconciled with unity by the Syrian persecution, ... 82—86

PAGE

The internal history of the Jews.

(*a*) *In Palestine;* during

i. The Grecian supremacy.
Rise of speculation — Sadducees; Pharisees; Essenes, ... 86—90
The prevalent Legalism to be traced in Ecclesiasticus and the traditional sayings of the doctors, 91, 92

ii. The Hasmonæan supremacy.
Impulse given to thought and writing (*Baruch*).
Revelation:
The Book of *Henoch* — *IV. Esdras*, . . 92, 93
Didactic narrative:
Tobit — *Judith*, ... 94, 95
History: I. Maccabees, ... 95

(*b*) *In Egypt.*

i. The LXX., ... 96, 97

ii. The age of philosophizing.
Aristobulus — *Jewish Sibyl* — *Philo* — The *Therapeutæ* — *Wisdom*, ... 98—101

General characteristics of the period; positive and negative, ... 101—107

NOTE. — *Synopsis of Early Jewish Literature*, ... 108, 109

CHAPTER II.

THE JEWISH DOCTRINE OF MESSIAH.

THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF THE MESSIAH.

In the patriarchal age — In the time of Moses; the Kingdom; the Captivity — The general forms which it assumed, . . 110—112

PAGE

The Apocryphal books contain no mention of Messiah, but anticipate a national restoration, ... 112—114

I. THE MESSIANIC DOCTRINE AS FURTHER DEVELOPED.

1. In the Apocalyptic Literature.

(*a*) The Sibylline writings (Egypt), ... 114—117

(*b*) The Book of Henoch (Palestine), ... 117—126

(*c*) The fourth Book of Esdras (Egypt), ... 126—132

(*d*) The Book of Jubilees (Palestine), ... 132—134

2. In the Exegetic Literature.

(*a*) The LXX. (Egypt), ... 134

(*b*) The Targums (Palestine) — Onkelos; Jonathan — The later Targums on the Pentateuch; Hagiographa — The Psalms of Solomon, ... 135—140

II. THE MESSIANIC DOCTRINE AS DESCRIBED IN HISTORIC RECORDS OF THE FIRST CENTURY.

1. The New Testament, ... 140—147

2. Contemporary Writers.

(*a*) Philo, ... 148, 149

(*b*) Josephus, ... 150, 151

(*c*) Heathen writers, ... 151, 152

III. THE LATER MESSIANIC DOCTRINE OF THE JEWS.

1. The Mishna, ... 152

2. The Gemara, ... 153—155

3. Later Jewish Books, ... 155, 156

4. Mystical Books, ... 156—161

PAGE

IV. THE DOCTRINE OF THE WORD.

1. In Palestine: the Targums, ... 161, 162

2. In Egypt: Philo, ... 162—166

General result, ... 166—168

Note I. — *Messianic prophecies in the New Testament compared with the corresponding interpretations of Jewish commentators*, 168—171

Note II. — *The Christology of the Samaritans*, ... 171—173

CHAPTER III.

THE ORIGIN OF THE GOSPELS.

The first Christian teachers entertained no design of handing down a written record of the Gospel — Such a design would have been wholly foreign to their national feeling, for the "literature" of Palestine was essentially traditionary, and the social position of the Apostles offered no advantages for the work — On the other hand, an oral Gospel was the natural result of their labors, . . . 174—177

I. THE ORAL GOSPEL.

1. Preaching was itself a necessary preliminary to the historic Gospel, and the means by which it was formed, . . . 177—179

In this work all the Apostles joined; and it was regarded as the characteristic of the Christian dispensation and of the Apostolic mission, ... 179

Thus "the Gospel" was the substance, and not the record, of the life of Christ — The Old Testament was the *written* word, ... 181

PAGE

This feeling survived even to the close of the Second Century, ... 181

2. THE ORAL GOSPEL OF THE APOSTLES WAS HISTORIC. This appears from

(*a*) The description given of the Apostolic office, . . 182

(*b*) The account of the Apostles' preaching, ... 183, 184

(*c*) The contents of their letters, ... 185—191

II. THE WRITTEN GOSPELS.

1. DISTINCTLY CONNECTED WITH THE APOSTOLIC PREACHING.

(*a*) St. Mark, ... 191—193

(*b*) St. Matthew, ... 194, 195

(*c*) St. Luke, ... 195

The evidence of St. Luke's Preface, ... 196—198

2. THE INTERNAL CHARACTER OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS FAVORS THE BELIEF THAT THEY AROSE FROM A COMMON ORAL SOURCE.

(*a*) The nature of the problem which they present, . 198

i. Their concordances threefold.

a. In general plan. *b*. In substance. *c*. In language, ... 200—205

ii. Their corresponding differences, ... 205

(*b*) The solutions proposed.

i. Mutual dependence, ... 206

ii. Common sources.

a. Written. *b*. Oral and written. *c*. Oral, . . 207—212

In relation to the form and substance of the Gospels: to their specific characters; to their language, ... 212—215

Tradition not necessarily a source of myths, 215, 216

CHAPTER IV.

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GOSPELS.

PAGE

Times of calm belief unfavorable to the *study* of the Bible, . . . 217
The characteristics of the Gospels brought out by modern controversy, 217

I. THE INDIVIDUAL CHARACTER OF THE GOSPELS implied in the idea of inspired history; and even necessary in their first form, from

1. THE NATURE OF THE SUBJECT. Divine: Human, . . 218—222

2. THE ELEMENTS CONTAINED IN THE APOSTOLIC TEACHING.

St. James, St. Paul, St. Peter, ... 222—225

3. THE FORMS OF THOUGHT CURRENT IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

Jew; Past—Roman; Present—Hellenist; Future—Alexandrine; Eternal relations—By which it was adapted to the wants of later times, ... 225—229

II. THE CANONICAL EVANGELISTS were fitted to preserve these original types of Christian faith,

1. THOUGH NOT CONSPICUOUS IN HISTORY OR TRADITION, . 229, 230

St. Matthew—St. Mark (St. Peter)—St. Luke (St. Paul)—St. John, ... 230—243
The general result of the position of the Evangelists, . . 243

2. THE DISTINCTNESS OF THE GOSPELS ATTESTED BY

(*a*) The practice of separate sects.
Ebionites (St. Matthew)—[Docetæ] (St. Mark)—Marcionites (St. Luke)—Valentinians (St. John,) 244—250

PAGE

(*b*) The judgment of the Church.

The Evangelic symbols. Augustine, ... 250—252

The consequences of the view, ... 252, 253

CHAPTER V.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN.

The contrast between St. John and the Synoptists, ... 254

CHARACTERISTICS OF ST. JOHN.

I. THE GOSPEL IN ITSELF, ... 255

1. ITS SPECIAL HISTORY, ... 255

(*a*) The life of St. John.

Later legends — His typical character, ... 257, 258

(*b*) The authenticity of the Gospel, ... 258

Its late date — The testimony of the Apostolic Fathers; of the Fathers of the second century; of heretical writers — The skepticism of the *Alogi*, 259—263

2. ITS SPECIAL CHARACTER, ... 264

(*a*) Language.

i. Words.

ii. Composition.

a. General characteristics: Directness; Circumstantiality; Repetition; Individuality of narrative; Personality of action, ... 268—271

b. Combination of sentences: Particles; Key-words; Parallelism, ... 272—275

PAGE

(*b*) Plan.

An Epic.
The object of the Gospel.
Its great divisions:
i. The Manifestation of Christ.
ii. The issue of the Manifestation, ... 275—281

(*c*) Substance, ... 281—283

II. THE RELATION OF ST. JOHN TO THE SYNOPTISTS, . 284

1. POINTS OF DIFFERENCE, ... 285

(*a*) As to locality and teaching, ... 286—291

(*b*) As to our Lord's Person, ... 291

2. POINTS OF COINCIDENCE, ... 291

(*a*) In fact, ... 292—294

(*b*) In teaching, ... 294—296

(*c*) In character.
The Lord. St. Peter. St. John, ... 296—304

The Relation of St. John's Gospel to a new world, . . . 304—308

CHAPTER VI.

THE DIFFERENCES IN DETAIL OF THE SYNOPTIC EVANGELISTS.

The differences of the Synoptists as to

I. THE NATIVITY, ... 310

II. THE BAPTISM, AND III. TEMPTATION, ... 314—318

IV. THE TRANSFIGURATION, ... 318—321

PAGE

V. The Passion, ... 321—326

VI. The Resurrection, ... 327—333

Conclusions from these characteristic differences, ... 333—335

Note. — *On the Day of the Crucifixion*, ... 335—342

CHAPTER VII.

THE DIFFERENCES IN ARRANGEMENT OF THE SYNOPTIC EVANGELISTS.

Few traces of a chronological arrangement in the Gospels, . . . 343—347

I. The Gospel of St. Matthew in its internal development, 347—360

II. The Gospel of St. Mark, ... 361—370

III. The Gospel of St. Luke, ... 370—383

General Summary, ... 384, 385

CHAPTER VIII.

THE DIFFICULTIES OF THE GOSPELS.

Difficulties arise from errors as to the character, the purpose, the historical authority of the Gospels, and from antecedent prejudices, . 386—391

They are useful intellectually, morally, and in connection with the whole scheme of Nature, ... 393—396

APPENDICES.

PAGE

APPENDIX A. ON THE QUOTATIONS IN THE GOSPELS, . . . 399—402

APPENDIX B. ON THE PRIMITIVE DOCTRINE OF INSPIRATION, . 402—445

§ 1. The Sub-Apostolic Fathers, 403—407. § 2. The Apologists, 407—411. § 3. The Church of Asia Minor, 412—416. § 4. The Roman Church, 416—419. § 5. The North African Church, 419—424. § 6. The Church of Alexandria, 424—440. § 7. The Clementines, 440—445.

APPENDIX C. ON THE APOCRYPHAL TRADITIONS OF THE LORD'S WORDS AND WORKS, ... 445—453

APPENDIX D. ON SOME OF THE APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS, . . 454—466

The Gospel according to the Hebrews, 454—457. *The Gospel of the Ebionites*, 457—460. *The Gospel of the Clementines*, 460—462. *The Gospel of Marcion*, 462—466.

APPENDIX E. A CLASSIFICATION OF THE MIRACLES OF THE GOSPELS, ... 466—469

APPENDIX F. A CLASSIFICATION OF THE PARABLES OF THE GOSPELS, ... 469—471

ADDITIONAL NOTES (AMERICAN EDITION), ... 472

INDEX, ... 473—476

INTRODUCTION

TO THE

STUDY OF THE GOSPELS.

INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER.

INSPIRATION, COMPLETENESS, AND INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE.

Ἔοικεν ὁ τὴν Ἶριν Θαύμαντος ἔκγονον φήσας οὐ κακῶς γενεαλογεῖν.
PLATO.

EVERY one who has paid any attention to the history of the Church must have felt the want of a clear and comprehensive view of the mutual relations and influences of speculation and religion, as they have been gradually unfolded by reason and revelation. In Theology and Philosophy we insensibly leave the positions of our Fathers, and rarely examine the origin and primary import of the doctrines which we have inherited or abjured. Words and formulas survive as silent witnesses or accusers, but we do not interrogate or heed them. Still it would be a noble and worthy task to determine the meeting-points and common advances of faith and science, and to discover how far each has been modified by the other, either in combination or in conflict. We might then follow the progress of man's material and spiritual life, from the beginning to the end of the Bible, from the mysteries of the Creation and the Fall to the dark foreshadowing of the final consummation of the world in the last chapters of

The importance of connecting the history of Philosophy and Religion in order to estimate rightly

the progressive development,

the Apocalypse. We might be able to mark the rise and growth of error, as well as its full and fatal development, and to learn under what guise of truth it gained acceptance among men. We might see how far the expression of the doctrine of the Church was re-shaped to meet the requirements of successive ages, and how far the language of its formularies was suggested by the opinions of the times in which they were composed.

the essential need, and

Nor is this all: we might find in philosophy not only the handmaid, but also the herald of revelation. We might trace in the writings of the heathen world the tendency of man's spontaneous impulses, and the limits of his innate powers. We might compare the natural view of our destiny in Plato or Aristotle with its fulfilment in the Gospel. We might be taught by them to value the privileges of a divine law, and a definite covenant, when they tell us, in the language of doubt and dependence, that there is something infinitely greater for which our mind still longs at the moment of its noblest triumphs; that the wants which modern skepticism would deny are real and enduring; that the doctrines which Natural Religion has assumed are not the proper heritage of thought; that the crowning mystery of the Incarnation is an idea as true to reason as it is welcome to the heart.

the peculiar aspects of divine truth.

Yet more, by such a view of the scheme of revelation we should be able to fix the source of the special objections which are brought against it, and to determine their proper relation to the whole. Men are always inclined to exaggerate the importance of a conflict in which they are themselves engaged, and to judge of everything as it affects their own position. A general change in the religious character of an age often leads to the disregard of some element, or the abandonment of some outwork, which is really essential to the perfection and integrity of revealed religion.[1]

1 Cf. an eloquent article by Quinet in the *Revue des deux Mondes*, 1838.

And if it be the first duty of an impartial student to estimate the exact force of his personal bias, that he may eliminate its influence before he determines a result, it is no less important for those who would judge rightly of the absolute value of current opinions to consider how much they owe to the characteristics of the present age, before they are assigned to their proper place as fresh steps in the progressive development of human wisdom.

The general effect of the course of modern Philosophy

During the last two centuries, to speak generally, there has been a steady advance from one extreme in philosophy to the other, — from naturalism to transcendentalism, — and the successive assaults on Christianity have exhibited a corresponding change. Religion and metaphysics are now contemplated from within, and not from without: the world has been absorbed in man. In spite of partial reäctions, the idea of the society, whether in the State or in the Church, has yielded to that of the individual; and whatever may be thought of the true precedence and relation of the two, it is evident that theology cannot have been unaffected by the new point of sight from which it is contemplated. Those who press the claims of the individual to the utmost, find in Christianity itself a system of necessary truth, independent of any Gospel histories, and unsupported by any true redemption. They abandon the "letter" to secure the "spirit," and in exchange for the mysteries of our faith they offer us a law without types, a theocracy without prophecies, a Gospel without miracles, a cluster of definite wants with no reality to supply them; for the mythic and critical theories, as if in bitter irony, concede every craving which the Gospel satisfies, and only account for the wide spread of orthodox error by the intensity of man's need. Christian apologists have exhibited the influence of the same change. They have been naturally led to connect the teaching of revelation with the instincts of man, and to show that even the mysteries of faith have some analogy

on the popular view of Christianity, and specially

with natural feeling or action. Meanwhile the power of Christianity, as embodied in a permanent society, — the depository and witness of the truth, — has grown less, and so it is now a common thing to depreciate the outward evidences of religion, which are not, however, essentially the less important because they appear inconclusive to some minds. Upon the widest view, history perhaps offers the fullest and most philosophical proof of the claims of Christianity; but however this may be, historical evidence necessarily demands attention even where it cannot convince; and as aforetime many who did not believe for Jesus' words, believed for His very works' sake, so still the external array of Christian evidences may kindle the true inner faith, and in turn reflect its glory.

on the doctrine of Holy Scripture as affecting its

The doctrine of Holy Scripture is specially liable to the influence of this transition from an objective to a subjective philosophy. The Written Word, by its manifold relations to the action of Providence, and the growth of Christian society, no less than by its combination of Divine and human elements, offers points of contact with every system, and furnishes infinite materials for speculation. A variety of questions arise at the outset of all intelligent study of the Bible which involve the solution of some of the most difficult problems of mental or critical science, and which consequently receive answers in accordance with the existing forms of thought. In what sense, it may be asked, is a writing of man God's message? How can we be reasonably assured that the record is exact and complete? In what way are the ordinary rules of criticism affected by the subject matter to which they are applied? It is evidently impossible to discuss such questions at present in detail: probably they do not admit of any abstract discussion; but it may be allowable to suggest some general principles affecting the Inspiration, the Completeness, and the Interpretation of Holy Scripture which may serve to open an approach to the study of it.

I. Inspiration.
II. Completeness.
III. Interpretation.

When the first act of the Reformation was closed, and the great men had passed away whose presence seemed to supply the strength which was found before in the recognition of the one living Body of Christ, their followers invested the Bible as a whole with all the attributes of mechanical infallibility which the Romanists had claimed for the Church. Pressed by the necessities of their position, the disciples of Calvin were contented to maintain the direct and supernatural action of a guiding power on the very words of the inspired writer, without any regard to his personal or national position. Every part of Scripture was held to be not only pregnant with instruction, but with instruction of the same kind, and in the same sense. Nor could it be otherwise, while men considered the Divine agency of Inspiration as acting externally, and not internally, as acting *on* man, and not *through* man. The idea of a vital energy was thus lost in that of a passive state, and growth was reduced to existence; for what is highest in a purely spiritual world becomes lowest in the complex and limited life of man. The rude but sincere violence of fanaticism, and the rapid advance of physical science, did much to shake this arbitrary theory; and those who were captivated by the first vigorous achievements of historical criticism and mental analysis hastened to the other extreme. The Bible, they said, is merely the book of the legends of the Hebrews, which will yield to the skilful inquirer their residuum of truth, like those of the Greeks and Romans. Inspiration is but another name for that poetic faculty which embodies whatever is of typical and permanent import in things around, and invests with a lasting form the transitory growths of time.

I. The Inspiration of Scripture.

The contrast between the Calvinistic and modern views of the Bible.

It is easy to state the fatal objections which a candid reader of Scripture must feel to both these views; and in a general sense it is not less easy to show how the partial forms of truth,

General objections to the objective and

in virtue of which they gained acceptance, may be harmoniously combined. The purely organic theory of Inspiration rests on no Scriptural authority, and, if we except a few ambiguous metaphors, is supported by no historical testimony. It is at variance with the whole form and fashion of the Bible, and is destructive of all that is holiest in man and highest in religion, which seeks the coördinate elevation of all our faculties, and not the destruction of any one of them. If we look exclusively at the objective side of inspiration, the prophet becomes a mere soulless machine, mechanically answering the force which moves it, the pen and not the penman of the Holy Spirit. He ceases to be a man while he is affected by the frenzy (*μανία*) of the heathen seers,[1] and in a momentary influence gives up his whole spiritual growth. But, on the other hand, if we regard inspiration only subjectively, we lose all sense of a fresh and living connection of the prophet with God. He remains indeed a man, but he is nothing more. He appears only to develop naturally a germ of truth which lies within him, and to draw no new supplies of grace and wisdom from without. There is no reünion of the divine and human in his soul on which a Church may rest its faith. He may deduce, interpret, combine truth, but in the absence of a creative power he is deficient in that which an instinct of our being declares to be the essential attribute

subjective theories of Inspiration.

1 Cf. Plat. Phædr. 248 D. It will be seen from his position in the scale that the prophet is regarded as one in whom all human powers are neutralized. Tim. 71 E, *οὐδεὶς ἔννους ἐφάπτεται μαντικῆς ἐνθέου καὶ ἀληθοῦς, ἀλλ' ἢ καθ' ὕπνον . . . ἢ διὰ νόσον ἢ διά τινα ἐνθουσιασμὸν παραλλάξας.* This idea of an "Ecstasy" was applied to the Prophets by the Alexandrian Jews, and adopted by the Montanists, but rejected by the Catholic Church. Cf. App. A, § 2. As to the occurrence of "ecstasy" in Scriptural records, cf. p. 12, n. 1.

Plato's idea of a possible inspiration is interesting; cf. Phæd. 85 D; Phædr. 244 A; 256 B; and in reference to oracles [Ion], 534 C; Tim. 71 D. In the passage which I have taken as a motto (Theæt. 155 D), he has expressed admirably the true relation of wonder to wisdom, faith to philosophy. The analogy is more striking when we call to mind the office of Iris — *ἔρω, εἴρω,* Ἶρις, the messenger.

of the highest teacher.[1] Such a theory removes all that is divine in our faith, and destroys the title-deeds of the Church's inheritance. It is opposed to the universal tenor of Scripture and tradition, and leaves our wants unsatisfied and our doubts unanswered by God. If it be true, man is after all alone in the world, abandoned to the blind issues of fate or reason or circumstance. His teachers are merely his fellow-men, and their words claim his hearing only so far as they find a response in a heart already influenced by personal and social life. And who then shall answer him that their promises are more than echoes of his own cravings; and that the ready acceptance which their doctrine has found is anything but a natural expression of the wants and wishes of men?

The possibility of gaining a true mean between them,

Happily, however, we are not confined to the two extreme theories: the elements of truth on which they are respectively based are opposite indeed, but not contrary. If we combine the outward and the inward — God and man — the moving power and the living instrument — we have a great and noble doctrine, to which our inmost nature bears its witness. We have a Bible competent to calm our doubts, and able to speak to our weakness. It then becomes, not an utterance in strange tongues, but in the words of wisdom and knowledge. It is authoritative, for it is the voice of God; it is intelligible, for it is in the language of men.

in respect to the teacher and the record.

The possibility of such a combination seems to follow directly from a consideration of the nature and form of Inspiration; and the same reflections which establish a necessary connection between inspired thoughts and inspired words, point out the natural transition from the notion of an inspired

[1] Ποιητής. Cf. Plat. Conv. 205 c. ἡ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ ὂν ἰόντι ὁτφοῦν αἰτία πᾶσά ἐστι ποίησις . . . . ἀπὸ δὲ πάσης τῆς ποιήσεως ἓν μόριον ἀφορισθὲν . . . . τῷ τοῦ ὅλου ὀνόματι προσαγορεύεται.

teacher to that of an inspired book, and justify the application of the epithet at once to the impulse and the result, an ambiguity which at first sight creates only confusion and embarrassment.

1. *The idea of Inspiration.*

Inspiration may be regarded in one aspect as the correlative of Revelation. Both operations imply a supernatural extension of the field of man's spiritual vision, but in different ways. By Inspiration we conceive that his natural powers are quickened, so that he contemplates with a divine intuition the truth as it exists still among the ruins of the moral and physical worlds. By Revelation we see, as it were, the dark veil removed from the face of things, so that the true springs and issues of life stand disclosed in their eternal nature. This idea of *Revelation* which regards power and truth and beauty as veiled, and yet essentially existing beneath the suffering and sin and disorder which are spread over the world within us and without, — over man and nature, — seems to be peculiarly Christian. Probably nothing but the belief in the Incarnation could give reality and distinctness to the conception of a "restitution of all things;" and St. Paul describes the possibility of a clear vision and transforming reflection of the divine glory as the especial privilege of believers. The change wrought in philosophy by the vital recognition of this idea penetrates to the very foundations of knowledge and hope. The "recollection" of Plato becomes intuition, and we can now by faith reverse the words of Plotinus, who thanked God that "he was not tied to an immortal body."[1]

The contrast between Inspiration and Revelation.

The idea of Revelation peculiarly Christian.

1 The usage of the word ἀποκάλυψις and ἀποκαλύπτειν in the New Testament is full of interest, as illustrating the Apostolic view of the objects of Revelation. The passages in which the words occur are the following:

Ἀποκάλυψις. i. The substantive occurs only once in the Gospels, when Simeon describes our Lord as "a light to dispel the darkness under which the heathen were veiled" (Luke ii. 32, φῶς εἰς ἀποκ. ἐθνῶν). Elsewhere Christianity itself, the very centre of all revelation, is described by St. Paul as "a

But while the idea of Revelation in its fullest sense appears to be essentially Christian, every religion presupposes the reality of Inspiration, of a direct, intelligible communication of the Divine will to chosen messengers. The belief in such a gift is in fact instinctive, and equally at least with the belief in a Supreme Being

The belief in Inspiration universal; and the difficulties which it involves common to all spiritual phenomena.

revelation of a mystery" (Rom. xvi. 25, ἀποκ. μυστ.); and so especially the great fact that the Gentiles should share equally with God's ancient people in the New Covenant was made known "by revelation" (Eph. iii. 3, κατὰ ἀποκ.). "Through revelation of Jesus Christ" St. Paul received the Gospel which he preached (Gal. i. 12, δι' ἀποκ. Ἰ. Χ.). The visions of St. John were "a revelation of Jesus Christ" (Apoc. i. 1). And even in details of action it was "by revelation" that St. Paul went up the second time to Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 2, κατ' ἀποκ.).

ii. Revelation also serves to express that insight into divine truth which God gives to his servants, and which all Christians are encouraged and bound to seek (Eph. i. 17, δῴη ὑμῖν πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ). Hence "Revelations"—peculiar manifestations of this general gift — are disclosed in the Christian assemblies (1 Cor. xiv. 6, 26); and St. Paul dwells particularly on the number of them which were granted to him (2 Cor. xii. 1, 7).

iii. But as the eye of the Christian is naturally turned to the coming consummation of the ages, "the revelation of Jesus Christ" in an especial sense is that second coming of the Lord, when all shall know Him (1 Pet. i. 7, 13, ἀποκ. Ἰ. Χ. 2 Thess. i. 7. 1 Cor. i. 7, ἡ ἀποκ. τοῦ Κυρ.). In this we look forward to "the revelation of His glory" when the robe of sorrow shall at last be thrown aside (1 Pet. iv. 13); and God's righteous judgment of the world made known (Rom. ii. 5, ἀποκ. δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ Θεοῦ); and then the sons of God shall be revealed in their full majesty, and creation shall rejoice in the sight (Rom. viii. 19, ἀποκ. τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ.).

Ἀποκαλύπτειν. i. The verb occurs more frequently than the substantive, but exactly in the same varieties of connection. By Revelation the prophets in old time gained an understanding of the glad tidings which they proclaimed (1 Pet. i. 12, οἷς ἀπεκαλ. κ. τ. λ.). By Revelation "the faith" was made known (Gal. iii. 23), and its fulness declared "in the spirit to the holy apostles and prophets" (Eph. iii. 5), in whom God was pleased to reveal His Son (Gal. i. 16, ἀποκ. ἐν ἐμοί).

ii. Then, again, by Revelation the personal knowledge of the truth is gained (Matt. xi. 25, 27. Luke x. 21, 22. Matt. xvi. 17); by Revelation God supplies what is yet defective in us (Phil. iii. 15), by special teaching (1 Cor. xiv. 30), or in general hope (1 Cor. ii. 10).

iii. And while a continuous Revelation of God's righteousness and wrath is still ever being made (Rom. i. 17, 18, ἀποκαλύπτεται), the Christian looks to that final manifestation of His infinite holiness, when the power of evil shall be at last "revealed" (2 Thess. ii. 3, 6, 8) in due time, and also "the Son of Man" (Luke xvii. 30), before whom he shall perish. Then shall be fulfilled the purpose of Christ's coming, when the thoughts of many hearts are unveiled (Luke ii. 35), as they were partially unveiled during His earthly work: then everything secret shall be revealed (Matt. x. 26. Luke xii. 2); for "the day is revealed" in fire to try men's works (1 Cor. iii. 13); then shall His

possesses the testimony of universal acceptance. Even intellectually the idea of Inspiration offers no extraordinary difficulties. To enlarge or inform any faculty is evidently a secondary operation of the same power by which it was first given and quickened. The intercourse between the Creator and the creature must, in common with all spiritual manifestations, remain a mystery; but that it does take place in some form or other is a matter of constant experience. And if we may venture to regard Inspiration merely as a mental phenomenon, it is not more remarkable that man's spirit should be brought into direct connection with the Spirit of God, than that one mind should be able to exercise a sympathetic influence upon another. That man is complex and finite introduces no difficulty which is not present in the ordinary processes of thought and life. And, on the contrary, this consideration fixes a limit to the extent of our inquiry; for all abstract analysis of Inspiration is impossible, since the Divine element is already in combination with the human when we are first able to observe its presence.

It is impossible to contemplate the Divine and human apart; hence we are limited to the examination of

Our inquiry is thus limited strictly to the character of

servants enter into the glory which even now is prepared for them (Rom. viii. 18. 1 Pet. v. 1; i. 5, σωτηρίαν ἑτοίμην ἀποκ.).

To neglect any one of these aspects of Revelation, which sets forth its fundamental, continuous, and final operation, is to mutilate the completeness of the Divine truth. The great work of Revelation, so to speak, yet remains.

The words do not occur in St. Mark, St. James, St. Jude, nor in the writings of St. John, except Apoc. i. 1, and John xii. 38 (from LXX.) And conversely φανερόω occurs very frequently in St. John, and also in St. Mark, but does not occur in St. Matt. or St. Luke. On the connection of γνωρίζω, φανερόω, ἀποκαλύπτω, cf. Eph. iii. 3—5. Rom. xvi. 26; i. 17; iii. 21. 1 Pet. v. 1, 4. The first regards the individual knowledge, the second the outward manifestation, the third the essential permanence, of that which is set forth.

In the LXX. the metaphor of ἀποκαλύπτειν is clearly brought out in its personal form in the phrases ἀποκ. τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς (Num. xxii. 31), and ἀποκ. τὸ οὖς (Ruth iv. 4). Ἀποκάλυψις first occurs in Sirac. xi. 27, but Jerome remarked (Comm. ad Galat. i. 12; Lib. i. p. 387) that the word "was used by none of the wise of the world among the Greeks." It is found in Plutarch. Cf. Plat. Gorg. 460 A, etc. (ἀποκαλύπτω). In like manner the Latin Christians, beginning with Tertullian, seem to have been the first, if not the only writers, who employed *revelatio* and the cognate words metaphorically.

Inspiration. The real existence of such an influence is proved at once by common belief and personal experience. The nature of its operation transcends the power of our thought; but it remains to examine the form which this Divine teaching bears when presented to men. And here a characteristic difference may be observed. In heathen nations the Sibyl or the Pythoness was the type of an inspired teacher; and Plato consequently places the prophet low in the scale of men, as one in whom all human powers of body and soul were neutralized.[1] The dream, the vision, the ecstasy, seemed to be the only means whereby the Deity could come into contact with man, and thus all personal consciousness was destroyed by the supernatural influence. In the records of the Bible, on the other hand, the teaching of Inspiration appears as one great element in the education of the world, and therefore it has an essential connection with the age and people to whom it is addressed, while its form varies according to the needs of men.

2. The form of Inspired teaching, in heathen and Biblical records.

Like every gift of God, inspiration is bestowed for some special end to which it is exactly proportioned. At one time we may picture to ourselves the Lawgiver recording the letter of the Divine Law which he had received directly from God, "inscribed upon tables of stone," or spoken "face to face." At another we may watch the sacred Historian, unconsciously it may be and yet freely, seizing on those facts in the history of the past which were the turning-points of a nation's spiritual progress, gathering the details which combine to give the truest picture of each crisis, and grouping all according to the laws of a marvellous symmetry, which in after-times might symbolize their hidden meaning. Or we may see the Prophet gazing intently on the great struggle going on around him,

The form is adapted to the special end; but in any case it exhibits

1 Cf. p. 32, n. 1.

discerning the spirits of men, and the springs of national life, till the relations of time no longer exist in his vision, till all strife is referred to the final conflict of good and evil, foreshadowed in the great judgments of the world, and all hope is centred in the coming of the Saviour, and in the certainty of His future triumph. Another, perhaps, looks within his own heart, and as a new light is poured over its inmost depths, his devotion finds expression in songs of personal penitence and thanksgiving; in confessions of sin and declarations of righteousness, which go far to reconcile the mysterious contradictions of our nature. To another is given the task of building up the Church. By divine instinct he sees in scattered congregations types of the great forms of society in coming ages, and addresses to them not systems of doctrine, but doctrine embodied in deed, which applies to all time, because it expresses eternal truths, and yet specially to each time, because it is connected with the realities of daily life.

a twofold character, since

But however various the forms of inspired teaching may be, in one respect they are all similar. In every case the same twofold character is preserved which arises from the combination of the divine influence with the human utterance. The language of the Lawgiver, the Historian, the Prophet, the Psalmist, the Apostle, is characteristic of the positions which they severally occupied. Even when they speak most emphatically "the words of the Lord," they speak still as men living among men; and the eternal truths which they declare receive the coloring of the minds through which they pass. Nor can it be said that it is easy to eliminate the variable quantity in each case; for the distinguishing peculiarities of the several writers are not confined to marked features, but extend also to a multitude of subtle differences which are only felt after careful study. Everywhere there are traces of a personality, not destroyed, but even quickened by the action of the divine power, — of an individual consciousness, not sus-

pended, but employed at every stage of the heavenly commission.[1]

Inspiration, then, according to its manifestation in Scripture, is *Dynamical*,[2] and not *Mechanical*, — the human powers of the divine messenger act according to their natural laws even when these powers are supernaturally strengthened. Man is not converted into a mere machine, even in the hand of God. But it may be asked whether this combination of letter and spirit be perfect or partial; whether the special human form be essential to the right apprehension of the divine idea; whether the shell be absolutely needed to preserve the kernel; or, whether the impress of personal character must be effaced before we can see the godlike image, and the outward covering be removed in order that the inner germ may grow and fructify.[3]

the personality of the teacher is preserved.

It might, perhaps, be a sufficient answer to such inquiries to point out the absolute impossibility of separating the two elements, the external and the internal, the historical and the doctrinal, the objective and the subjective, however we choose to name them. But the truth of this general statement becomes more clearly apparent if regard be had to the

This personality an essential part of the conception,

1 The cases of spiritual ecstasy mentioned in Scripture are obviously exceptional and distinct from prophetic inspiration. The second rapture of Saul is easily intelligible from the circumstances of the narrative; and on the former occasion it is expressly mentioned that *God gave him another heart* before he prophesied (1 Sam. x. 6, 9—16). When St. Paul was carried up to Paradise, the words which he heard were not for the instruction of the Church, but *unspeakable words, which it is not lawful* (ἐξόν) *for a man to utter* (2 Cor. xii. 4). The outpouring of "tongues" was addressed to God, and not to man (1 Cor. xiv. 2).

On the other hand, the personal characters of Balaam and Caiaphas remain unchanged when they utter unwillingly or unconsciously Divine truths.

2 The word is open to many objections on other grounds, and not least from its technical application; but I can think of no better one which may be conveniently used to describe an influence acting upon living *powers*, and manifesting itself through them according to their natural laws, as distinguished from that influence which merely uses human *organs* for its outward expression, as, for instance, in the accounts of the Demoniacs.

3 Cf. Tholuck, *Glaubwürd. der Evang. Gesch.* s. 429 ff.

conception, the expression, and the communication of thought. The slightest consideration will show that words are as essential to intellectual processes as they are to mutual intercourse. For man the purely spiritual and absolute is but an aspiration or a dream. Thoughts are wedded to words as necessarily as soul to body. Language is a condition of our being, determining the conception as well as the communication of ideas, as in the first record of our race we read that Adam, while still in solitude, gave names to all the creatures which passed before him.[1] Without it the mysteries unveiled before the eyes of the seer would be confused shadows; with it they are made clear lessons for human life.

the expression, and

But, even if it were possible for the prophet to realize truth otherwise than according to the capacity of his finite mind, still something would be wanting. It is not enough that the sacred teacher should gaze upon the eternal truths of religion, like the disembodied spirits in the Platonic Phædrus,[2] he must be able to represent them fitly to other men. And when addressed to man, the human element becomes part of the message from heaven; for the divine can be grasped by him only when defined and moulded according to the laws of his own nature. The book is thus rightly said to be inspired no less than the prophet.

the record of the Divine truth.

The book reflects and perpetuates the personal characteristics of the prophet, but it does not create them. Writing introduces no limitation into the representation of truth which does not already exist in the first conception and expression of it. The isolated writing bears the same relation to the whole work of the prophet as the prophet himself to the world from which he is chosen. The partial and incomplete record preserves the clear outline of such features in his character and mission as were of importance for the guidance of the future Church.

1 Cf. Donaldson's *New Cratylus*, p. 62. 2 Phædr. 247 D; 249 C.

On following out the lines of thought thus lightly sketched, it will appear, I think, that, from a Christian point of view, the notion of a perfect Dynamical Inspiration is alone simple, sufficient, and natural. It presupposes that the same providential Power which gave the message selected the messenger; and implies that the traits of individual character, and the peculiarities of manner and purpose, which are displayed in the composition and language of the sacred writings, are essential to the perfect exhibition of their meaning. It combines harmoniously the two terms in that relation of the finite to the infinite which is involved in the very idea of revelation. It preserves absolute truthfulness with perfect humanity, so that the nature of man is not neutralized, if we may thus speak, by the divine agency, and the truth of God is not impaired, but exactly expressed in one of its several aspects by the individual mind. Each element performs its perfect work; and in religion, as well as in philosophy, a glorious reality is based upon a true antithesis. The letter becomes as perfect as the spirit; and it may well seem that the image of the Incarnation is reflected in the Christian Scriptures, which, as I believe, exhibit the human and divine in the highest form, and in the most perfect union.

Thus Inspiration of Scripture is plenary, and yet

For when it is said that the Scriptures are everywhere quickened by a principle of spiritual life, it is already implied that they exhibit an outward development. The Divine teaching, though one, is not uniform. Truth is indeed immutable, but humanity is progressive; and thus the form in which truth is presented must be examined in relation to the age in which the revelation was made. At one time it is to be sought in the simple relations of the patriarchal household; at another, in the more complicated interests of national existence; at another, in the still deeper mysteries of individual life; at another, in the infinite fulness of the Saviour's work, or in the perplexing difficulties which beset

adapted to a progressive humanity.

the infant Churches. But each form has its proper and enduring lesson: each record constitutes a link in the golden chain which, to use the Homeric allegory, has again bound the earth with all its varied interests to the throne of God.

3. The relation of Inspired writings to Christian life.

The personal consequences which flow from this view of the Inspiration of Scripture are too important not to find a passing notice here. Truth is brought into a connection with life by the recognition of the human element in its expression which it could not otherwise have. The several parts of the Bible are thus united, not only by the presence of a common object, but also by the impress of a common nature. The history of Christ Jesus is concrete doctrine, as doctrine is abstract history. The Christian finds in the records of the Lord's life a perfect pattern for his own guidance, as well as the realization of the Apostolic teaching. However wonderful each action of the Saviour may be as a manifestation of power, providence, and love, he seeks yet further for its personal relation to himself; for he knows that the Evangelists, men even as he is, felt truly the inner meaning of the events which they record, and truly told their outward details. All the holy writings, as we read, have but one end, that we may be *thoroughly furnished to all good works*, and this is obtained by their entire adaptation to our complex nature. Nor will any one who is conversant with the history of ancient systems be inclined to think lightly of the use thus made of the simplest instincts and powers of humanity in the revelation of the highest mysteries. The fundamental error of the most pious of the ancient philosophers lay in their misapprehension of the relation of the finite to the infinite. They sought a system of absolute truth, independent of the specific laws of human life, and vainly labored to raise men out of the world. They had no gospel for the simple and poor, for the mechanic and the slave. In the pursuit of wisdom they disparaged common duties,

and deferred the business of social life and of explanation of the popular faith till they should have solved the riddle of self-knowledge.[1] They cherished and set forward one part of man's nature to the destruction of the others. The end of philosophy was declared to be the isolation of the soul: the work of life only the contemplation of death. Christ, on the contrary, finally uniting in one person God and man, fixed the idea of spiritual life in the harmonious combination of faith and works, and left His disciples in the world, though not of it. The tree which symbolizes the Christian faith springs from earth and is a resting-place for the birds of heaven;[2] the leaven spreads through the whole[3] man; for humanity is not removed by the gospel doctrine, but clothed with a spiritual dress.[4]

4. The proofs of the Inspiration of writings.

The various proofs which may be adduced in support of the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of Holy Scripture, according to the sense in which it has been already explained, are various in kind, and will necessarily appear more or less forcible at different times and to different minds. On the one hand, assuming that the writings of the New Testament are, in part at least, the works of men whose Divine commission was attested by sensible miracles, we may appeal to the fact that they claim to speak in the name and by the authority of Him by whom their mighty works were wrought.[5] Or we may collect the passages which the

(a) External. i. The supernatural commission of the Apostles.

1 Cf. Plat. Gorg. 527 D; Phædr. 229 E.

2 Orig. Tom. XIII. in Matt. § 5. Οὐδὲν μὲν τῶν ἀπτέρων, τὰ δὲ ἐπτερωμένα πνευματικῶς.

3 Cf. Trench, *Notes on the Parables*, p. 115. Olsh. *in l.*

4 Cf. Plat. Phæd. 64 A; 67 D.

5 The reality of an *objective* Inspiration of the Apostles is clearly assumed in the New Testament.

i. The Gospels. Matt. xvi. 17; x. 19, 20; Mark xiii. 11; John xiv. 26; xvi. 12—15.

ii. The Acts. Ch. viii. 26, 29; x. 19; xi. 12, 28; xiii. 2; xv. 28; xvi. 6, 7; xxi. 11.

iii. The Catholic Epistles. 1 Pet. i. 10—12; 2 Pet. i. 19—21; 1 John ii. 20.

iv. The Pauline Epistles. 1 Thess. iv. 2 (2 Thess. iii. 6); 1 Cor. ii. 10; xiv. 37 (2 Cor. iii. 18); Gal. i. 11, 12; Rom. viii. 16; xvi. 26; Eph. iii. 3—6; 1 Tim. iv. 1; 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.

The same doctrine is implied in the Pauline phrase κατ' ἐπιταγήν, Rom. xvi. 26; 1 Cor. vii. 6 (25); 2 Cor. viii. 8;

apostolic writers have quoted from the Old Testament, and comparing the spiritual lessons which they draw from them with the simplest meaning of the text, form some general conclusions as to the sense in which they regarded the words of the prophets, as indeed the Word of God.[1]

ii. The analogy of the apostolic use of the Old Testament.

Or, descending still lower, we may show that the Christian Fathers with one consent affirmed in the most complete manner the inspiration of the Scriptures, placing the writings of the New Testament on the same footing with those of the Old, as soon as it was possible that the apostolic records could rise with clear preëminence above the oral tradition of the apostolic teaching.[2] On the other hand, we may examine the character and objects of the books themselves, and put together the various facts which appear to indicate in them the presence of more than human authority and wisdom, no less in the simplicity and apparent rudeness of their general form than in the subtle harmony and marvellous connection of their various elements. And if this method of proof is

iii. The testimony of the Church.

(b) Internal.

1 Tim. i. 1; Tit. i. 3. And on the other hand the corresponding change in the believer—"the revelation of eye and ear"—is vividly set forth; 2 Cor. iii. 18; Col. iii. 10. This change extends to each element of man's complex nature. His spirit (πνεῦμα) is aided by the Spirit of God that it may know the blessings of the Gospel (1 Cor. ii. 12). His reason (νοῦς) is furnished with new intuitional principles by which to test the Divine counsels (Rom. xii. 2, ἀνακαίνωσις τοῦ νοός). His understanding (διάνοια, Eph. iv. 18) is enlightened so as to recognize the True One (1 John v. 20. Cf. Eph. i. 18, πεφωτισμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας, al. διανοίας). And according to the measure of this change Inspiration is a blessing of all ages and all Christians.

The distinction of τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ Θεοῦ and ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, which are both rendered *the Word of God* in the English version, and *Verbum Dei* in the Vulgate, is important in relation to the doctrine of the Inspiration of Scripture. The former phrase occurs: Matt. iv. 4 (= Deut. viii. 3); Luke (ii. 29); iii. 2; John iii. 34; viii. 47; Rom. x. 17; Eph. vi. 17; Heb. vi. 5; xi. 3; 1 Pet. i. 25 (= Is. xl. 8). The latter is more frequent: Mark vii. 13; Luke v. 1, etc.; John x. 35, etc.; Acts iv. 31, etc.; Rom. ix. 6; Col. i. 25; Heb. iv. 12, etc.; 1 Pet. i. 23, etc. The distinction is lost also in the Syriac and Gothic Versions. In Eph. vi. 17, Tertullian (i. p. 152) strangely reads *Sermo Dei*.

1 Cf. App. A. On the Quotations in the Gospels.

2 Cf. App. B. On the Primitive Doctrine of Inspiration.

less direct and definite than the other; if it calls for calm patience and compels thought in each inquirer; it is also broader and more elastic, capable of infinite extensions and applications. Nor is it less powerful even while it is cogent. To many, perhaps, the inward assurance which it creates is more satisfactory than the rigid deductions of direct argument. The unlimited multiplication of convergent presumptions and analogies builds up a strong and sure conviction possessing a moral force which can never belong to a mere formal proof, even where the premises are necessary truths.

In what sense a proof of Inspiration is possible.

To speak of the *proof* of the Inspiration of the Scriptures involves, indeed, an unworthy limitation of the idea itself. In the fullest sense of the word we cannot prove the presence of life, but are simply conscious of it; and Inspiration is the manifestation of a higher life. The words of Scripture are spiritual words, and as such are spiritually discerned.[1] The ultimate test of the reality of Inspiration lies in the intuition of that personal faculty (πνεῦμα) by which inspired men once recorded the words of God, and are still able to hold communion with Him. Everything short of this leaves the great truth still without us; and that which should be a source of life is in danger of becoming a mere dogma. At the same time, it is as unfair and dangerous to reject the teaching of a formal proof as it is to rely upon it exclusively. It cannot be an indifferent matter to us to bring into harmonious combination the work and the writings of the Apostles; to follow and faithfully continue the clear outlines of scriptural criticism as traced in the writings of the New Testament; to recognize the power which the Bible has hitherto exercised upon the heart of the Church, and the depths which others have found in it. Such investigations will necessarily lead to other and more personal questions. We shall ask naturally whether we have any clear conception of the position which the first

[1] 1 Cor. vii. 12—16.

Christian teachers occupied, and the results which they accomplished? Whether we have ever fairly estimated the extent to which the different Books of Scripture are penetrated by a common spirit? Whether the fault be not in ourselves, if occasional difficulties are allowed to destroy the effect of those divine words which have been for ages a spring of life? And thus a new field will be opened before us; and in this case ever-deepening conviction is the result and the reward of labor. For there is this essential difference between an outward and an inward — a logical and a moral — proof, that while the one can be handed down from one generation to another, in all its formal completeness, gaining no fresh force and admitting of no wider application, the latter only exercises its full influence by the personal appreciation of each element of which it consists, and adapts itself to every shifting phase of thought from which it draws its strength.

The internal evidence of Inspiration illustrated specially by

To examine at length the details which suggest this internal proof of inspiration is at once useless and impossible. Their effect lies in the individual point of sight from which they are regarded, and their weight in their infinite variety. But one or two remarks on the Gospels may serve to illustrate different lines of thought which will furnish abundant materials for private study; and it is by this only that their real value can be estimated.

i. The negative character of the Gospels.
a. Their fragmentariness; while

In the first place, the negative character of the Gospels, the absence of certain features which we should have expected to find in them, is too striking not to arrest attention. They are fragmentary in form. Their writers make no attempt to relate all the actions or discourses of our Lord, and show no wish to select the most marvellous series of his mighty works; and probably no impartial judge will find in any one of them a conscious attempt to form a narrative supplementary to those of the others. But if we know by the ordinary laws of criticism that our

Gospels are the only authentic records of the Saviour's life, while we believe that Providence regards the well-being of the Christian Church, are we not necessarily led to conclude that some divine power overruled their composition, so that what must otherwise seem a meagre and incomplete record should contain all that is fittest historically to aid our progress and determine our faith? Nor can it be unworthy of notice that while the Gospels evidently contain so small a selection from the works and words of Christ, so few details unrecorded by the Evangelists should have been preserved in other ways. The interval between the Gospel of St. John and the Synoptists indicates the existence of many intermediate forms of doctrine of which tradition has preserved no trace. The numerous witnesses of our Lord's works and teaching must have treasured up with affection each recollection of their past intercourse; but the cycle of the Evangelic narrative is clearly marked; and it cannot but seem that the same Power which so definitely circumscribed its limits determined its contents.[1]

they contain nearly all that we know of the life of Christ.

Again, the Gospels are unchronological in order. We are at once cautioned against regarding them as *mere* history, and encouraged to look for some new law of arrangement in their contents, which, as I shall endeavor to prove, must result from a higher power than an unaided instinct or an enlightened consciousness.

b. Their deficiency in chronology.

Once more, the Gospels are brief and apparently confused in style. There is no trace in them of the anxious care or ostentatious zeal which mark the ordinary productions of curiosity or devotion. The Evangelists write as men who see through all time, and only contemplate the events which they record in their spiritual relations. But, at the same time, there is an originality and vigor in every part of the

c. Their simplicity of style.

1 Cf. App. C. On the Apocryphal Traditions of the Lord's Words and Works.

Gospels which become a divine energy in the Gospel of St. John. As mere compositions they stand out from all other histories with the noble impress of simplicity and power; and it is as if the faithful reflection of the Image of God shed a clear light on the whole narrative. The answer was once given to the Pharisees when they sought to take Jesus, that *never man spake like that man*, and those who assail the authority of the Gospels have been constrained to confess that never was history written as in them.[1]

John 7: 46.

If we regard the subject of the Gospels it would indeed be strange if this were not so. The New Testament does not contain a mere record of ordinary facts, or a collection of indifferent conclusions, but lays the historic groundwork of man's redemption, and builds up his practical faith. In narrative, in doctrine, and in prophecy, the same great truths are brought forth under different relations of time. And thus the connection of events, the arrangement of arguments, and the choice of symbols, may serve to exhibit in clearer and more varied outline the whole structure of Christianity. For nothing can be immaterial which is able to influence our idea of the Saviour's life, or to alter the application of Christ's teaching. The history must be not only true to the outward form, but true to the inward spirit; the proof must be not only convincing, but effectual; the prediction must not only answer to the event, but cohere with the whole scope of prophetic revelation. It may, indeed, be easy to quote passages in which we do not see the importance of the minuter details of the Scriptures; for we cannot know the secret experience of all Christians; but it would be equally easy to prove that there is no singularity in expression or detail, no trait of personal feeling or individual conception, in the Gospels, which does not in some one place greatly affect our notion of Christ's teaching. And thus, unless the peculiarities of each writer were

ii. The subject of the Gospels.

1 Cf. Gaussen, *Theopneustia*, pp. 238 ff. (Eng. Tr.)

chosen to exhibit a special aspect of truth, they must in some degree distort it.

iii. The social teaching of the Gospels.

But though we shall dwell frequently in the course of the following pages on the characteristic differences of the Evangelists, we must not forget that, while they work separately for the instruction of individuals, they have a common service to perform in the edification of the Church. Their writings must be combined as well as analyzed, and we must carefully construct the general doctrines which they teach us by a comparison of scattered passages. All true sense of the absolute unity of the Diatessaron, as distinguished from its unity of form, is commonly lost by separating miracles, prophecies, and parables, instead of combining them. We regard them, as a child might regard the stars, as chance sparks of heavenly light, because we have not observed the law which rules their order. Yet it is in the perfection and oneness of their social teaching, so to speak, that the strongest internal proof of the plenary inspiration of the Gospels is to be found. The office of the apostles was not only personal, but public. They had not merely to appropriate subjectively the truths of salvation, but to set them forth for the instruction of the whole Christian Society. Their inspiration is to the Church what enlightenment is to the believer. For as we hold that there are rights which belong to the state rather than to the citizen, so there are doctrines which pertain to the whole body of the faithful rather than to its several members. Such doctrines are the great mysteries of nature — foreknowledge and providence — which find their proper centre in the social, and not in the personal existence. But, nevertheless, their truest resolutions must be sought in the life of Him, by whom the whole world was reünited to God. We must consider how far each miracle and prophecy helps us to complete our idea of the power and foresight of God, in reference to the wants and works of man; and how far each parable sug-

The application of this teaching.

gests the glorious truth of the inner harmony of the universe. The manner in which these questions — the foundation-doctrines of a Christian community — are treated by the Evangelists is such as to exclude the idea of a mere personal intuition, for that leaves no room for those combinations in which the fulness of the Gospel lies. However far one Evangelist might have been led by the laws of his own mind, it requires the introduction of a higher power that four should unconsciously combine to rear from different sides a harmonious and perfect fabric of Christian truth.

1. In order to understand the full force of miracles we must bear in mind their double aspect — outward as well as inward — as works of power and works of redemption. The former view, which was almost exclusively studied in the last two centuries, is now well-nigh forgotten,[1] through that spirit of our own times, to which we have already alluded; but still the miracles are as important to the Christian faith providentially as morally. And as their redemptive significance is deep and varied, so is their outward manifestation perfect in extent and glory. It has been well observed that there is nothing in them contrary to nature, while all is above nature; that the laws of existences around us are not broken, but resolved into higher laws; that there is no creation out of nothing, but a freeing of the primitive order (κόσμος, *mundus*[2]) from the lets and limitations of sin. Again, it is equally true, though less observed, that they penetrate into every class

a. Miracles.

1 Pascal rises far beyond his own age when he says, "Les figures de l'Evangile pour l'état de l'âme malade sont des corps malades." (*Pensées*, ii. 372, Faugère).

2 The word κόσμος in this sense was first used by Pythagoras (Plut. de Plac. Phil. II. 1). *Mundus* occurs in Ennius (*cœli mundus*), and yet Cicero evidently speaks of the word as strange and unusual even in his time (de Univ. x. *lucens mundus*). It will not fail to strike the attention, that while the Greeks and Romans regarded the outward beauty and order of creation as giving the truest name to the world, the Hebraizing Greek and Rabbinical writers should have regarded "the ages" (αἰῶνες, עוֹלָמִים) as the right denomination of that where interest centres rather in the moral than in the physical order.

of being with which we are connected — material, animal, and spiritual; that they now involve and again exclude natural means; that they alike give life and destroy it; that they rise above the laws of matter and change its accidents. The constancy and harmony of nature have been converted into an argument against an almighty Providence;[1] and in miracles we find the proper vindication of the perpetuity and extent of the Creator's power. They prove His presence in all things against those philosophers who, from the time of Epicurus,[2] confound the law and him who works according to the law; and, by a strange confusion, substitute, as it were, a theory of motion for a living force. There is, as I trust to show, at once a perfect distinctness in the practical and doctrinal import of each miracle, and a perfect unity in their final aim; so that the completeness of their cycle and the variety of their applications suggest to us the influence of a higher power on the Evangelists than a mere "intuitional consciousness."[3]

b. Parables.

2. While the miracles show that a sustaining power is everywhere present in nature, the parables reveal no less clearly the divine harmonies by which it is penetrated. For parables are more than arbitrary similitudes. In part they explain those higher relations of our existence to which the common events of life should lead us, and realize in religion the Socratic example. They connect the principles of action with the

1 Cf. Galen. de usu Part. xi. 14 (quoted by Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 540 n). The following passage of Goethe (Tholuck, *Glaubwürd*, s. xiv.) expresses plainly the assumption which lies at the basis of much criticism at present: Du hältst das Evangelium, wie es steht, für die göttlichste Wahrheit; mich würde eine vernehmliche Stimme vom Himmel nicht überzeugen, dass das Wasser brennt . . . Vielmehr halt' ich dies für eine Lästerung gegen den grossen Gott und seine Offenbarung in der Natur.

2 Cic. de Nat. Deor. i. 25. Epicurus ait . . . atomum, quum pondere et gravitate directo deorsum feratur, declinare paullulum. It is remarkable that a change of motion did not supply the idea of some external power. "Attraction" is but a name to describe the action of force, and assumes the existence of that of which it cannot explain the origin.

3 Cf. Rogers, *Reason and Faith*, Ed. Rev. Oct. 1849, pp. 344–6.

principles of faith, and appeal to the heart of man as a witness of his true duties to God and his fellow. In part, they connect the natural with the spiritual world, and show how the laws of natural progress correspond to the course of spiritual development. And at the same time they give us some glimpses of the union of man with higher and lower intelligences, and explain that mutual dependence of all things which the Manichæan and Gnostic failed to recognize, and thence fell into the most fatal and blasphemous errors, — till we are led to realize the glorious words of St. Paul, that *all creation* (κτίσις) *waiteth for the manifestation of the Sons of God, groaning and travailing in pain until now.*

Rom. viii. 19—22. *Cf. Eph. i.* 10, 20—3; *Col. i.* 20; *Phil. ii.* 9, 10.

3. Again, we are taught to recognize the working of Providence not only in the outer world of nature, but also in the inner world of action; while experience shows that the control of the general result is reconciled with individual freedom.[1] To this end the reality and depth of prophecy is set before us in the records of Judaism, of which Christianity is, in the highest sense, the proof and fulfilment.[2] In the various events detailed in the Old Testament Scriptures, *which were written for our learning*, the Jews became *figures of us.* The private fortunes of their monarchs, and the national revolutions of their race; the general import of their history, and the wider significance of their prophecies, as well as the more explicit predictions, all receive their complete accomplishment in Messiah

c. Prophecies.

1 *Cor. x.* 6, 11.

1 The confirmation of this great doctrine by statistics is one of the most striking results of modern science. Cf. a table from M. Quetelet in Mrs. Somerville's *Physical Geography*, ii. pp. 383–4.

2 Le Vieux Testament est un chiffre. Pascal, *Pensées*, ii. 247; cf. pp. 242 ff. The Jews had a proverb: Vana lex donec venerit Messias. Cf. Orig. de Princ. iv. 6, quoted in App. B. What is needed to interpret this cipher is shortly expressed in the words of our Lord (Luke xxiv. 25), ὦ ἀνόητοι (νοῦς) καὶ βραδεῖς τῇ καρδίᾳ (διάνοια. cf. Eph. i. 18, varr. lectt.). Compare also Rom. i. 21, ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς . . . καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία. Eph. iv. 17, 18, ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νοὸς αὐτῶν ἐσκοτισμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ.

and His kingdom. It is then through the Evangelists that the Holy Spirit has afforded us a true insight into the inner meaning of the Prophets, who were the *historians* of the elder dispensation, as in the Epistles He has set forth the antitypes of the ancient law. That is surely a meagre theology and unscholarlike criticism which finds nothing more than a fanciful adaptation in the Scriptures quoted in the opening chapter of St. Matthew, and nothing deeper than an arbitrary variation in the different words by which each passage is introduced. On the contrary, it seems as if, from verse to verse, the full glory and wisdom of the past were gradually disclosed to us, as we are directed to regard the types of the Messiah in the crises of personal or national history; and then to acknowledge the fulness of the more distant Christian analogies in the outward fortunes of the Jews; and, lastly, to accept the reality of the minuter deductions from their prophetic teaching.[1]

II. *The completeness of Scripture. Statement of the case.*

But if we admit the Inspiration of Scripture as sufficiently proved by external and internal evidence, a difficulty still remains, — for how, it may be asked, can it be shown that the collection of inspired writings forms a complete record of the revelation which it commemorates? There was a time when the Bible, which we regard as one volume and call by one name, existed only in its separate parts,

1 (α) Matt. i. 22, τοῦτο ὅλον γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῇ. 14.

A *personal* historic type, Is. vii. (44.) Immanuel (cf. viii. 1) — Jesus.

(β) Matt. ii. 15, ἦν ἐκεῖ—ἵνα πληρωθῇ.

A *national* historic type, Hos. xi. 1. Israel — Messiah.

(γ) Matt. ii. 17, τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥηθέν.

An *analogy* in Jewish history, Jer. xl. 1. The mother of Israel weeping for her children taken from her.

(δ) Matt. ii. 23, ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν.

A deduction from prophetic language. Psalm xxii. 6. Is. liii. 3.

It is very remarkable that the final conjunctions (ἵνα, ὅπως) *never* occur with the optative in the New Testament, unless Eph. i. 17, iii. 16, may possibly be exceptions. Is the explanation to be sought for in the fact that the truest instinct leads us to regard every issue as still working and waiting for a present accomplishment?

till at length it gained its present form after long and anxious questionings. And though we believe that history bears clear witness to our canonical books, and to no others, still history, it may be said, cannot assure us that they contain all the points of divine truth which it is needful for us to know. Whatever is taught by Inspiration is authoritative; but how can we learn that all necessary elements of inspired teaching have been committed to writing? At the first glance the several books appear to be disconnected and incidental. In many cases they were composed to meet the wants of a special crisis, — to instruct, to correct, to confirm individuals or churches. There is nothing to show that the Apostles, if we regard only the New Testament, entertained any design of delivering to future ages a full written account of the Christian faith, or a perfect system of Christian doctrine. On the contrary, there is a marked difference in the points of sight from which they regard the Christian dispensation; and they all seem to shrink in common from claiming for their own writings a rank coördinate with that of the Old Testament Scriptures.

The difficulties are real, and yet

The slightest thought will show that such inquiries will not admit of one peremptory answer, though the traditional view of Holy Scripture, by which we regard the several books as necessarily connected, renders us to a great extent insensible to many of the difficulties which they really involve. This traditional belief has, indeed, practically its proper use and reward; but where investigation is possible, belief must be the goal and not the starting-point, the conclusion and not the premiss of our reasoning.

analogous to those which are found in common life,

But while we allow that the difficulties thus raised are real, they are still not singular or exceptional, but analogous to those common mysteries of our being which are rarely felt, only because they are universal. The action of Providence in every case is lost in a mystery. In one aspect most things in the

life of an individual seem to be casual and unimportant; and yet, when we observe from time to time indications of a providential plan in its general course, we practically admit that the same superintending power penetrates into those apparently trivial details which really mould the character of the whole. So, again, in the history of nations: it is at first difficult to recognize how the feuds of party and the confusion of popular cries can form any part of a divine scheme for the government of the world; and yet, when we discover on a wide survey traces of such a controlling influence, we are forced to allow that it extends to common things, and works by means which antecedently seem totally inadequate to the issue. Or, to take yet another example: the vast and various convulsions which have broken up the surface of the earth, and covered it with scars and ruins, seem little like the manifestations of infinite wisdom; and still, when it is known that they were needed to fashion the fair diversity of woods and waters, and to bring within the reach of man the treasures stored up by certain laws in the depths below, we acknowledge that Providence not only inspires the general law, but acts equally by those changes and outbreaks which interrupt its ordinary working.

in society,

in nature.

These examples of the action of Providence in the individual, in society, in nature, will illustrate the form in which we may expect it to be shown in securing the completeness of the records of revelation; for, in relation to Holy Scripture, the belief in Providence is the necessary supplement to the belief in Inspiration. And if we find that God works concurrently with the exercise of man's free agency; that He finds even in the weaknesses and imperfections of His creatures efficient service; that the traces of a plan and purpose which are disclosed by a comprehensive view of His dealings, suggest the existence of order and completeness throughout, and

Their solution to be sought for in the notion of Providence.

reconcile us to the presence of disturbing influences, — we may reasonably expect to meet with similar phenomena in the relation of Providence to Scripture; so that it will be no fatal objection to the completeness of the Bible, that it is composed of writings not only occasional and personal, but also beset with various conflicting difficulties, if there are clear signs of a consistent historical recognition of this completeness, and also traces of a mutual dependence and general unity in the books themselves.

Universal History and

For though it is true that history cannot prove directly the completeness of the Scriptures, it can furnish strong presumptions that they are complete. The same divine messengers who committed to writing the original records of revelation, embodied their teaching in a visible society. The Bible and the Church trace back their claims to the same source, and each can appeal to the other to bear witness to its permanent integrity. If then it appear, to take one example, that the earliest description of the Christian body recognizes exactly those elements which are found in the apostolic writings; if the Articles of Belief and the forms of worship are exactly those which are either suggested or prescribed in them; if Christians with a common consent appealed to the New Testament, as soon as its constituent books were collected into one volume, as an adequate and final source of Christian doctrine; and if the same be true of the Old Testament, — no one who believes that the lessons of Providence are legibly written in the instinctive judgments of society will doubt that the Bible was intended to be that for which the Church has received it — a complete record of all that was of permanent import in successive revelations. That the proposed conditions are satisfied by the mutual relations of the Scriptures and the Church from age to age, history can show most clearly. The indistinctness which hangs over isolated details arises commonly from the narrowness of the field of sight. On a wide view nothing can be more striking than the inde-

pendence and unity of the written Word and the organized Body. And this independence and unity offer the clearest proof of their individual symmetry and completeness.

Criticism confirm the belief in the completeness of Scripture; for

Nor is this all: it is possible that some outward symmetry may be found to exist in the mutual relations of the different fragments of which the Bible consists; and the argument from design is proportionately more convincing as the elements in which the design is traced are more numerous and naturally less connected. That this is so, seems indeed to be indicated by the very form of the Bible. To take an illustration again from the New Testament: the obvious analogy between the quadriform Gospel and the four classes of Epistles, the peculiar fitness of the Acts as a mediative element to connect them together doctrinally and historically, the lasting significance of the Apocalypse as a prophetic and typical view of the fortunes of the Church to the end of time, create an impression of original unity among the component parts which thus produce a well-proportioned whole. And if, on a further examination of the books, it appear that the different characters of their writers, the variety of styles in which they are composed, the manifold circumstances by which they were called forth, contribute, in each case, some distinctive feature to the image of truth which they combine to produce, is not the idea of completeness a natural consequence of a combination as marvellous as it is unexpected? But the subtle organization of Scripture, no less than that of nature, is only revealed to a watchful and attentive eye. A passing hint may arouse inquiry, but nothing less than a patient and candid study of the Bible can convey any notion of the intimate relations which exist between its several parts. Each fresh point of sight presents to the eye new harmonies of detail and form. On a full survey contrasts are successively exposed and subdued; irregularities are brought within the general plan; ornaments gain a constructive importance; and, as in some noble

monument, each well-wrought fragment is stamped with the marks of independence and design. The circumstances under which each workman wrought, no less than the peculiarities of his work, prove his real independence; and the manner in which every peculiarity contributes to the whole effect, shows that all alike were obedient to the design of one great architect.

a tendency to symmetry and order is all that we can yet see in the other works of God.

If it be still said that there are gaps and chasms in the Canon; that the structure does not, in all respects, correspond to the plan; that much appears unfinished and insecure, — it may be enough to reply, that there is at least a clear tendency towards unity in its different parts, not discernible at first, but growing ever clearer to those who look most closely into it; and that such a tendency towards order and perfection is all that can as yet be found in the worlds of nature and man, though these are confessedly complete in design, as being the immediate works of God. The distinctness of this first revelation is obscured by the existence of evil in a thousand forms, which seems to contradict our notions of almighty power and love; and it is likely that the same kind of difficulties should reäppear, however God makes himself known. If, then, we acknowledge in nature a perfection of plan, though we cannot make it out in all its details, and complete by faith the order which we see commenced at intervals, it is reasonable to regard the completeness of Scripture in the same way, and to submit patiently to the existence of uncertainties and difficulties in the Bible, which we find also in the only other manifestations of God's working with which we can compare it. They may, indeed, be necessarily introduced by the narrow range of our observation and experience, or be absolutely necessary for our probation and discipline. And though this mode of arguing may perhaps seem weak and inconclusive to those who have scarcely felt the difficulties which it is intended to meet, yet it may be remarked that we can

have nothing to guide us but analogies and presumptions, ideas of fitness and order, gathered from the outward government of the world, when we endeavor to reason on God's dealings with man. Nor can it be said again that such analogies only exist between the revelation in nature and the revelation to men; for what is true of the original revelation is true also of the permanent record. The individual character, as has been already shown, is an essential part of both, as far as man is concerned. The finiteness and imperfection of human nature must everywhere be felt in Divine things; and the supposition that a complete record of revelation may be found in writings apparently casual and fragmentary, introduces no difficulty which is not already found in another form in the primary conception of revelation, and in the first expression of its truths. In all alike, God works through man according to the natural laws of thought and action; and thus the One becomes manifold, and the whole can be contemplated only in its component parts.

The record as well as the original Revelation.

From what has been said, it follows that the personal conviction of the Inspiration and Completeness of Scripture depends, in a great measure, upon the accurate study of the Sacred Writings themselves; and thus it is important to fix within certain limits the great principles by which they must be interpreted. Nor is this difficult in a general sense, however many difficulties may be involved in the application of the principles to every detail. Two great objects appear to be included in the work of the interpreter: the strict investigation of the simple meaning of the text, and the development of the religious teaching which lies beneath it. The first regards the form, and the second the spirit of Scripture. The one rests on the acknowledged permanence of the essential relations between thought and language; the other, on the Providential pur-

III. *The Interpretation of Scripture. The object of Interpretation twofold—to secure*

1. *The literal, and*
2. *The spiritual sense.*

pose which is seen to exist in the successive records of the Divine history of the world. The religious truth is conveyed through the medium of human conceptions; and human conceptions are used for the expression of religious truth. The essence of Inspiration does not lie in the form alone, or in the spirit alone, but in their combination. If the form be the result of direct Inspiration, it follows that Scripture contains a revelation of pure physical truth, which is contrary to experience; if, on the other hand, the action of Inspiration be limited to the spiritual element, it follows that this must be separable from the form, which has been shown to be impossible.

1. Literal Interpretation based upon strict grammatical criticism.

At a time when extended criticism has proved that the very inflections of words have a mental significance, and answer to some peculiarity of race, it seems almost superfluous to remark, that idioms of language are but the embodiments of national character; that an idiom is the starting-point and not the end of inquiry. Yet long tradition has sanctioned the application of principles to Biblical criticism which are abandoned in all other subjects; and it has been held to be a final answer in difficulties of expression in the Old and New Testaments that they are "Orientalisms." If this be true, it is evident that the difficulty is only removed one step further back: why, it must be asked, was the Eastern phrase so turned? of what mental condition is it a symptom? Surely we may believe that the Hebrew spirit still lives in the characteristics of the Hebrew language; and if so, the close analysis of each Hebrew idiom will lay open something of the inner workings of that mind through which the world was prepared for "the kingdom of God."

The importance of accurate analysis of language in the New Testament, from the

The theory of "Orientalisms" has exercised its most fatal influence on the interpretation of the New Testament. The presence of a foreign coloring in the Greek writings of the Apostles is so striking, that we may be inclined

to smile at the labors of the purists of the last century. But to one who looks beneath the surface, this combination of Hebrew idiom with Greek words is a fact of the utmost significance. The Hebrews realized more vividly than any nation the present working of God in the world, and contemplated even nature from a theocratic standing-point. The Greeks, again, scrutinized with the nicest discrimination the powers of man and the objects of sense; and, by a vocabulary of infinite fulness, perpetuated the knowledge which they gained. And what more fitting vehicle can we conceive for the enunciation of the highest truth than that Hebraizing Greek which unites all that was noblest in the forms of Hebrew thought with all that was richest in the stores of Greek expression?

complexity of the dialect.

But it is said that the Alexandrine Greek was a mixed and degenerate dialect, and that it therefore offers no sure ground for minute criticism. With equal reason the student of Euripides might complain of the arbitrary license of Homer or Theocritus, because they do not conform to the Attic standard; and yet the most startling anomalies of the earliest and latest authors can be reduced to an arrangement in harmony with the general principles of language. The transition from the Greek of Aristotle to that of St. Paul is in fact less abrupt than might have been expected; but even if it were as great as it is commonly supposed to be, the real state of the case would remain unchanged. The laws of syntax and the sense of words may be modified in the lapse of time, or by external influences; but the great law, by which words are the living exponents of thought, remains unchanged, and the modifications are themselves necessarily subject to some law. It is reasonable to expect that the grammar of the New Testament may not in every point coincide with the grammar of Homer, or Herodotus, or Xenophon. The style of

Impurity of a dialect no argument for treating it uncritically.

Grammar depends on thought; and, while it varies in form,

St. Paul or St. John may differ as much from that of each of these as they differ severally from one another. But it is the work of the scholar to determine the specific character of the writer before him, and to explain in what way he has been led to diverge from the normal type of expression. And, further, the laws which determine the continuity of language are not broken by the infusion of foreign elements, as long as the language retains a living energy. The history of our own literature proves that it is a mere assumption that a language loses even in precision by the incorporation of new forms and words. On the contrary, increased facility of expression gives occasion for the fixing of minute differences of conception which would otherwise be evanescent. And when the Apostolic writers use a Greek dialect, variously modified by Eastern thought, they are not removed from the pale of strict criticism, but rather present a problem of unusual interest from the various relations of the elements which it combines.

survives the greatest revolutions in language.

Nor can it be urged against this view that the Apostles were unlettered men, and consequently unlikely to speak with exactness; for it is certain that the use of provincial dialects is no less strict than that of the purest idiom. The very power of language lies in the fact that it is the spontaneous expression of thought. Education may extend the range of knowledge, but experience is an adequate teacher of that which lies before us. Even, naturally, Galilæan fishermen were no less qualified than others to watch the processes of the spiritual life, and adapt to their own needs the words which the Septuagint had already consecrated to a divine use.

And this is true of rude dialects as of refined.

All intelligent interpretation of Scripture must then be based upon a strict analysis of its idioms and words. To suppose that words and cases are convertible, that tenses have no absolute meaning, that forms of expression are accidental, is to

The tendency of the disregard of language.

betray the fundamental principles on which all intercourse between men is based. A disbelief in the exactness of language is the prelude to all philosophical skepticism. And it will probably be found that the same tendency of mind which discredits the fullest teaching of words, leads, however little we may see it, to the disparagement of all outward revelation.

2. Spiritual Interpretation based on the Literal Interpretation.

But when the interpreter of Scripture has availed himself of every help which historical criticism can furnish for the elucidation of the text,—when, by the exact investigation of every word, the most diligent attention to every variation of tense and even of order, the clearest recollection of the associations of every phrase, he has obtained a sense of the whole, perfect in its finer shades and local coloring, no less than in its general outline and effect,—his work is as yet only half done. The literal sense is but the source from which the spiritual sense is to be derived; but exactly in proportion as a clear view is gained of all that is special in the immediate object and position of each writer, it will be found that the simple record appears to be instinct with Divine life; for, as has been already noticed, the external circumstances and mental characteristics of the writer are not mere accidents; but, inasmuch as they influence his apprehension and expression of the truth, they become a part of his Divine message. And the typical speciality which springs from this is the condition at once of the usefulness and of the universality of Scripture.

Attested by the usage of the Apostolic writers.

The existence of an abiding spiritual sense underlying the literal text of the Old Testament is sufficiently attested by the quotations in the New. Unless it be recognized, many of the interpretations of the Evangelists and Apostles must appear forced and arbitrary; but if we assume that it exists, their usage appears to furnish an adequate clew to the investigation of its most intricate mazes. It must always be

a difficult task to appreciate rightly the spiritual lessons of history, to detect the real analogy between past and present, to understand the fleeting symptoms of good and evil, to compare the several sides of truth and error; but the task is one which is ever assigned to men. Mere mechanical infallibility is but a poor substitute for a plenary inspiration, which finds its expression in the right relation between partial human knowledge and absolute Divine truth. And if this view imposes upon the interpreter of Scripture a work of endless labor, at least it clears from his way formidable difficulties which would otherwise beset him, and that not by any arbitrary division of the contents of the Bible, but in virtue of its essential character. The inspired truthfulness of the prophet does not lie in the view which he takes of natural phenomena, but in the relation in which this partial conception stands to some spiritual lesson. It is a noble and glorious task to follow into their remotest results, and reduce to their simplest forms, the laws which govern the world in relation to ourselves; but this is not the work of the messenger of revelation. It is enough that he should view nature as his contemporaries view it, while at the same time he adopts exactly so much of the popular belief as serves to illustrate and explain his message. The "days" of creation, the "windows of heaven," the "steadfastness of the round world," the "hand of God," and the like, are expressions which, while they are intelligible to the simplest minds, perpetuate at the same time great facts which the highest culture can scarcely realize. No part of human knowledge is absolute, except such as follows directly from the laws by which the mind of man is limited; and probably it will be found that elements of permanent truth lie hid in the various aspects of nature preserved in the Bible, as in the doctrines of the Apostles there are certainly traces of the anticipation of wants which have scarcely yet been fully realized after the course of ages.

The spiritual sense the primary sense of Scripture.

Meanwhile the Interpretation of Scripture no less than its true Completeness is being ever set forth in the history of the Church. The Christian is not even outwardly alone in the endeavor to gain the manifold lessons of revelation. The same Providence who guided the composition of the Bible, has also furnished a Commentary on it in the fortunes of mankind. And it will easily be seen that there is a perfect analogy between the Church and the Scriptures in their relation to the private Christian. When united they complete the circle of his external defences; but if they be separated, he is led either into superstition or into doubt. Both contain and convey mediately the grace necessary for his support, and yet only so far as the Holy Spirit works with and through them. The outward form in each case brings the essence within the reach of *man*, and places within our grasp that which is otherwise too subtle for our present senses. The enunciation and the embodiment of truth are adapted to our finite nature; and it is alike unreasonable to say that we do not need a true Bible and to maintain that a definite Christian society is unnecessary for the full unfolding of the spiritual life.

The Interpretation of Scripture outwardly realized in the Church.

Yet there are difficulties in detail which must be brought before the individual judgment. Carelessness, we allow, has given currency to false readings in the text of Scripture; but the number and variety of the authorities which may be used to correct them is not only unequalled but unapproached in the range of ancient literature. The laws of criticism are absolute, and the Christian may confide with implicit reverence in their issues. Heresy, again, may draw its doctrine from the Bible; but what does that show, except that Scripture has many sides, which must be combined and harmonized, and not severed and distorted according to the bent of our private will? The laws of language, as those of criticism, are absolute, and the Christian may

The province of criticism.

trust in them as the certain outward expression of the deepest truths.

Criticism hallowed by a spiritual influence.

Nor can the existence of these final difficulties appear strange and unnatural. We have no reason to conclude, from our knowledge of the whole character of God's dealings, that He might be expected to preserve ever inviolate what He has once given. The world, which was at first good, is now full of evil; man, who was at first blessed, has fallen under the curse of sin; and such contingencies seem to be involved necessarily in the idea of a finite existence. But a redemption has been wrought for both; and so too, on the historical side of our religion, an uncorrupted Bible lies before us, if we patiently and candidly search for it, and a true personal interpretation may be gained by sincere and faithful study. In both cases, however, the task is something more than a merely mechanical or intellectual process. Whoever has watched attentively the workings of his own mind, will feel that in criticism and philology there is still room for the operation of that Spirit of God which is promised to the Christian scholar. Variations may exist on the one side, and ambiguities on the other, which disappear when brought before the scrutiny of the spiritual judgment.

Summary of the plan of the Essay.

It will be my object in the following Essay to determine in what way the principles thus indicated may be applied to the study of the Gospels; to determine how far their origin and contents fall in with the general order of Providence, and suggest the presence of that deep and hidden wisdom in which we have found the characteristic of Inspiration. And if it can be shown that the Gospel sums up in the record of the Incarnation all that was evolved of spiritual import in the long discipline from the Captivity to the Advent; if it can be shown that the time at which they were written was at once most suited to their publication, and yet least likely to have given birth to them; if it can

be shown that they grew up as it were spontaneously in the Church without effort and without design, and yet have a distinct relation in their four-fold diversity to the past and future wants of the Church; if it can be shown that in the difference of letter there is a perfect unity of spirit; that there is a special tendency and plan in the writing of each Evangelist, arising out of the position which he held in the Catholic Church; that the varieties of detail and the succession of incidents converge to one common point, and conduce to one common end; if it can be shown that in particular parts the teaching of the different Gospels may be combined into a whole of marvellous symmetry and completeness, — the residuum of difficulties and alleged discrepancies will seem of little weight. We shall see a noble view opened of the relation of the Gospel to the former and future history of the world, and of the Gospels to the Gospel itself. We shall feel that deep sense of the continual presence of the divine influence, and that firm conviction of the unerring truthfulness of the sacred writers, which can only be gained by a comprehensive view of the complete subordination of every part of Scripture to the training of man and the realization of his hopes. We shall then find nothing superfluous in the repetitions of the Gospels, and nothing inconsistent in their variety, any more than in the fresh groupings and different prospects of some earthly scene. We shall understand, with the great master of Alexandria, that "every word, if rightly viewed, effects a special purpose;" for revelation *is not a vain thing for us; it is our life.*

CHAPTER I.

THE PREPARATION FOR THE GOSPEL.

Αὐτομάτη ἡ γῆ καρποφορεῖ, πρῶτον χόρτον, εἶτα στάχυν, εἶτα πλήρης σῖτος ἐν τῷ στάχυϊ. — St. Mark iv. 28.

The true idea of History.

The Bible is the oldest and truest vindication of the dignity of history. When the Jewish Church numbered the ancient records of their state among the works of the prophets, they acknowledged that insight and foresight are only varieties of the same faculty, differing in their objects and not in their essence. The present, if we could read it rightly, contains the past and future, though that which is real and abiding is enveloped in a mass of confused details, so that it is visible only to the eye of the true seer. This follows indeed from the nature of the case; for truth in itself is absolutely one. But though it is one in itself it can only be manifested partially; and human history, in the highest sense, is the record of its successive manifestations in the life of men and man. In this respect History may be likened to the gradual unveiling of some godlike figure. The imagination of the inspired artist can divine its perfect form from the contemplation of the first fragment, but to the common sight it passes slowly from stage to stage to the fulness of its finished beauty. But each part which is revealed remains open forever. History is not only progressive in its course, but also progressive in the form of its teaching. All its records are held together by a real harmony, and instinct with one design. Each fresh convul-

sion leaves the earth further advanced towards its final purpose, though for the time it is covered with ruins. And in this sense History is a nobler Biography, the tale of a nobler life than man's; for even if at present we can but see it dimly, there appears to be a common life not only in nations, but in the world, if the best conception of life which we can form is that of activity combined with organization, the permanence of the whole reconciled with the change of the parts, a power of assimilation and a power of progress.

The coming of Christ is the centre of human history; and

Any real appreciation of Christianity, in its world-wide relations, must rest upon some such view of History as this. Christianity cannot be separated from the past any more than from the future. If we may venture so to speak, it was not an accident or an after-thought, but foreknown "before the foundation of the world." The Incarnation, as it is seen now, is the central point of all History. And more than this, if we regard the great issues of life, all past history, as far as it has any permanent significance, appears to be the preparation for that great mystery, and all subsequent history the gradual appropriation of its results. Isolated efforts were made in ancient times to anticipate the truth for which men were waiting; and opposing powers sought to check its influence when it was set forth in the life of Christ; but premature development and open antagonism served in the end to display the supremacy and consolidate the power of revelation. The Gospel was no sudden or solitary message. The legend of Pallas is the very converse of the Nativity. Christianity is, in one sense, as ancient as the Creation, resting on a foundation wide as the world and old as time. Step by step the ground-work of the Church was laid in the silent depths, and at last, when all was now ready, it rose above the earth, that all men might consciously combine to rear the spiritual temple of the living God.

What is true of the subject of the Gospel is true, in a

less complete degree, of the record. The writings of the New Testament are not a separate and exceptional growth, but the ripe fruit of minds which had been matured through long ages of various fortunes and manifold influences. The very language in which they are written is in some sense an epitome of ancient history. For it was the will of Providence that the people whom He destined to become the special depository of His revelations should not only develop their individual character, but also, by contact with Egypt, Persia, Greece and Rome, assimilate the foreign elements necessary to the perfection of their work. The history of the Jews thus becomes, as it were, the key to the history of the world; and, by regarding the various stages through which it passed, it is possible to distinguish the various constituents which combined to form the character of the Apostles and to prepare men for their teaching.

the record of the Gospel is impressed with the result of a world-wide training.

It follows, as a necessary consequence, that the Old Testament is itself the divine introduction to the New. In the records of the religious life of the Jews, in the settling of worship, and the widening of hope, it is possible to see the foreshadowings of apostolic doctrine, while the vicissitudes of their national history exhibit most clearly the growing purposes of God. A kingdom was reared on the ruins of the theocracy. A hierarchy succeeded to the place of the vanquished kingdom. When the Law of Moses had lost its power under the complicated forces of advancing civilization, it was quickened with a new life by the zeal of the prophets; and the labors of priests and scribes in after-time formulized what the prophets had taught, that a conquered and tributary people might yet find a definite support for their ancient belief.

The outlines of this training partly preserved in the Old Testament; and

But the records of the Old Testament deal only with the central periods of the history of Israel, the times of direct spiritual instruction, of the Law, and the Prophets;

and the last period of preparation which followed the Captivity, like the first preparation in Egypt, is too often regarded as a blank. Yet it is in this especially that we must trace the growth of that spirit which fixed the limits of Judaism and prepared the way for the advance of Christianity. Even in the absence of a continuous literature the progress of the people is marked clearly by definite events, fruitful in lessons on the course of national life.

partly to be sought in the post-biblical history of the Jews, which is pregnant with important issues both from

The mission of Ezra, "the second Moses" as he was called, like that of the first, was followed by a period of silence. It was needful that the law which was written on tables should be realized in life. Meanwhile Persia had a work to accomplish for Israel no less than Egypt; and till this was done, the wisdom of the East was not yet exhausted. Afterwards the work of Persia was transmitted, in due time, to Greece and Rome; and the Jew gained suppleness and strength from a literature and an empire as wide as his own faith. His faith also was tried by the most varied alternations of fortune. At one time a line of native heroes gave unity and independence to a subject race; at another, a foreign despot attempted to found a wide dominion upon the basis of the ancient creed. Hope followed hope; and the last form of Jewish nationality was shaped under the heavy pressure of critical vicissitudes. The rivalry of the Samaritans, the rise of the Hellenistic Church, the tyranny of the Syrian kings, the fall of the Maccabæan dynasty, the subjection of Palestine to an Idumæan dependent of Rome, disciplined the people for the coming of Messiah.

its outward vicissitudes, and from

And while the outward fortunes of the Jews after the Captivity were thus varied with progressive phases of one growing purpose, the changes in their inner life were not less remarkable. The century after Ezra was a time of silence, but it was

its inward revolutions, during the Persian *and*

also a time of activity. New faculties were called out by a new order of things. An age of reflection followed an age of inspiration. The guidance of prophets had followed the close of the theocracy; and in turn the prophets were replaced by doctors *(Sopherim)*. Schools of learning methodized the study of the law. The scribe and the lawyer succeeded to the authority of the priest; and, in the words of the Talmud, "the crown of learning was nobler than that of empire."[1] The definite collection of Holy Scriptures marked, indeed, formally, as well as practically, the cessation of the immediate teaching of the Spirit. The Canon, regarded as a whole, demanded interpretation, and defined the range of learning. Vernacular paraphrases of the sacred Writings satisfied the wants of the congregation, and deeper investigations into their meaning occupied the place of philosophy.

Grecian *periods.*

The conquest of the East by Alexander interrupted the course of this national development, and introduced a new element into Jewish life. The Hebrew and the Hellenist stood side by side, at one time in strange combination, and again in angry rivalry. It seemed as if a new Israel were rising on the banks of the Nile, not only trained in the wisdom of Egypt, but courting its favor. And even in Palestine there were clearer signs of the coming close of the Jewish dispensation than the existence of Sadducees or Herodians. The unity of the nation was still symbolized in the Temple, but the Synagogue recognized the existence of its component parts. The people looked backward or forward for the manifestation of God's Power, but for the moment they rested on the ordinary protection of His Providence. They were, no less than before, God's heritage, but they were also numbered among the kingdoms of the earth.

It is in the great changes thus roughly sketched that we must look for the true connection of the two Testaments.

1 Steinschneider, *Jüdische Literatur*, p. 359 (Ersch u. Gruber, Encykl. 1850).

Unless they are taken into account, the very language and form of the Apostolic writings must be unintelligible; for every page of the New Testament bears witness to the depth and permanence of the effects which they produced. Nor is there anything unnatural in regarding a period unmarked by any direct impress of Divine interposition, as cherishing in darkness germs of spiritual life to be quickened in due time. On the contrary, the great epochs of revelation are widely separated by ages, which serve at once for harvest and seed-time. Such were the intervals of silence before the call of Abraham, during the Egyptian captivity, and before the mission of Samuel; and it may not be a mere fancy if we discover some analogy between the period of natural development in the Jewish nation which preceded the birth of our Lord, and that period of natural and silent growth which ushered in His ministry. The inward conflict was completed before the outward manifestation was begun. Even when the Divine power was withdrawn from visible operation, it was no less certainly engaged in bringing within its control new powers, and opening new fields for its future work. The end itself came only with the "fulness of time."

The foundations of Christian thought and writing were laid in these periods,

silently and

Slowly, and almost imperceptibly, this measure of time was filled. The interval between the Captivity and the birth of Christ was not only fertile in critical combinations of different elements, but ample space was given for each to work its full effect. For two centuries after the Captivity the Jews[1] grew up under the dominion of Persia; for about a century and a half they were under Greek rulers; for a century they enjoyed independence under the Hasmonæan princes; and for

slowly.

1 If the word had been current, I should have preferred to say *Judæans*. In this way a threefold name would significantly mark a threefold history: *the people of Israel — Judæans — Jews;* the first name marking their providential, the second their local, the third their sectarian position.

more than half a century Rome was supreme through the government of her instruments. Or, if we include the Captivity, it may be said that for three hundred years the spirit of the East was dominant in Judæa, to be followed, for a like period, by the spirit of the West.[1]

This follows from a general survey of the effects of

What then, to define more clearly the outline which has been already drawn, were the characteristic influences of these two great periods? How can we best represent their effects upon the "people of God?"[2]

I. The Persian period, as to

The Captivity in Babylon, as has been already noticed, is in some respects analogous to that in Egypt, in its relation to the history of the Jews. In both cases the Jews were brought into contact with a nation whose material power was scarcely greater than its intellectual culture. In both cases important changes were wrought in the organization of the people which clearly represented the influence of their conquerors. But the two exiles were distinguished essentially in their character. The oppression in Egypt was manifested in the personal bondage of individuals; the captivity in Babylon was the political subjection of the nation. In Egypt we can see a people trained to patient endurance and ready submission among masters whose idol was science, and whose watchword was changelessness. In Persia we can see the same people exhausted by vain hopes, and, lamenting a fallen kingdom, led to contemplate the sublime truths of a spiritual world among teachers whose

1 The division of the periods corresponds to that of the first two schools into which the Hebrew writers are divided. The age of the *Sopherim* began with Ezra, and ended with Simon the Just. The age of the *Tanaim* began after the death of Simon, and extended to the close of the second century.

2 For the history of the Jews during the Persian period Ewald is by far the most important authority (*Geschichte Ezra's und der Heiligherrschaft*, Göttingen, 1852). The smaller work of Jost (*Allgemeine Geschichte*, u. s. w. 1832) is a valuable summary. Raphall's *History of the Jews* (vol. i. ii., London, 1856) contains much useful matter, but in a very uncritical form. For the later period Jost's longer work is available. Herzfeld's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, u. s. w., I have not been able to see.

perception of the antagonism of good and evil, even amidst the worst corruptions, seems to have been only less clear than that of their Persian conquerors. The Jews came up out of Egypt an entire people, bound together by common descent and common sufferings; the voice of Sinai was still sounding in their ears when they approached the borders of Canaan; the miracles of release were but a prelude to miracles of conquest. They returned from Babylon no longer as a separate nation, but as a colony, to form the central point of a religious commonwealth; they returned to hear the last words of prophecy from those who had guided their course, and to recognize in the writings of the past the abiding lessons of God; they returned as tributaries to a foreign power, and yet with a freedom for hierarchical development which hitherto had been denied them. The revolution in their national hopes, in their spiritual position, in their social organization, was distinct and critical.[1]

(a) National hopes. The Jews by losing their independence gained a truer spiritual union and higher hopes.

The return from Babylon was partial, and not general. The people of Israel passed from Egypt, one united tribe, to take possession of a promised kingdom, and to assert their national independence. From Persia only a small band of exiles came back to the home of their fathers, while the mass of their countrymen still lingered in the land of their captivity, and were content to retain their faith while they sacrificed their patriotism. Henceforth the Jews ceased to form one people in a political sense, though they had found a spiritual bond which could transcend all national differences. While they fought for different masters, and even met face to face in adverse lines, they could still serve one God with undivided

1 Outwardly the annals of the Jews from the time of Nehemiah (B. C. 445) to the invasion of Alexander (B. C. 332) are indeed brief. One event only is mentioned — the murder of his brother by a high priest in the temple: Joseph. Ant. xi. 7. 1. But there are traces of oppression on one side, and heroic endurance on the other: Hecat. ap. Joseph. c. Apion. 1. 22.

The chronological errors of the Rabbins, in consequence of this silence of history, which introduce a difference of 240 years, are noted by Raphall, i. 33.

worship. But however insignificant the returning exiles may have been in numbers and wealth, yet the return was necessary; and from being the centre of a kingdom Jerusalem became the centre of a creed. But the difference was most significant. The growth of a Church succeeded to the growth of a people, and the sympathies by which its members were united grew wider, as the sources from which they rose became more truly spiritual. In losing their independence the Jews lost also something of the narrowness of their first views.[1] No longer needing the close limits of Canaan to shut them off from foreign influences, they were prepared to maintain their faith in whatever land they visited. Deprived of their hereditary dominion, they were led to look forward to a more glorious period of power, when a Son of David should found an eternal and boundless kingdom. Under the presence of foreign rule they clung to the sure promises of their higher destiny; and, with higher hopes than they had ever realized before, a few poor exiles went forth to conquer the world.[2]

(b) Spiritual position. As a consequence of this the prophetic work ceased, and

When once the people was inspired with this new principle of life, the prophetic work was ended. It remained only to ponder over the teaching of the old prophets, and to read their words in the light of a new faith. The promises were already given, and only a suspension of creative energy was needed that it might be possible to contemplate with steady and undiverted eye the treasures of the past. In this sense the Jews were stationary during the Persian period; but stationary only so far as they entered on no new ground, while they were busy in mastering every position in that which had been already occupied. And, as if to prepare them for such a period of repose and silence, the last words of Malachi pointed to no new prophet,

1 It cannot, however, be determined when the court of the Gentiles was added to the Temple. Ewald, iv. 197.

2 Cf. Renan, *Etudes L'histoire du Peuple d'Israel*, p. 121; a brilliant sketch of Jewish history from Ewald's point of view.

but to Elias himself as the herald of the last and greatest crisis in their history. To some the very name of Malachi — the Messenger[1] — seemed to announce a new epoch, and the later tradition which identified him with Ezra was only a bolder expression of the same idea.

the prophetic writings were collected.

But when the personal work of the prophet was finished, the need of the collective prophetic teaching was deeper than ever; and the warnings of ancient history were then sought for most earnestly, when the records which contained them were, for the mass of the people, as sealed books. The generation which grew up in exile adopted the Aramaic dialect (Chaldee), which had been already introduced into Palestine by the Chaldæan invaders, and thenceforth Hebrew ceased to exist as the national language. But the want and the difficulty mutually relieved each other. The providential change of language suggested a general limit within which the voice of inspiration might be heard, as the fearful chastisements of the captivity turned men's minds to the old Scriptures with a devotion unknown before.[2]

1 Cf. Ewald, p. 201, n.

2 The history of the Jewish Canon is necessarily obscure. The books of Moses appear to have been united under the title of the Law from a very early period (2 Kings xxii. 8; cf. Josh. xxiv. 26, 1 Sam. x. 25?); but though the later prophets exhibit a familiar acquaintance with the works of their predecessors, there is no evidence to show that the prophetic writings were either formed into a definite collection, or connected with the law before the exile. The earliest trace of such a collection of the prophets (omitting the questionable passage, Dan. ix. 2) occurs in Ecclesiasticus (xlviii., xlix), where the writings of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel are mentioned in detail, and "the memorial of the twelve prophets" blessed. The book of Daniel seems thus not to have been reckoned among the prophets at that time, though from the absence of authentic evidence it is impossible to mark the successive steps by which the present Canon was determined. Prescriptive usage, as in the case of the New Testament, is the clearest witness of its early history, till the persecution of Antiochus, like that of Diocletian, definitely separated the holy writings of the suffering Church from its remaining literature. But the fact that the Hebrew book of Sirach was not admitted into the Palestinian Canon is a sufficient proof that the distinction existed practically long before; and it is generally allowed that the contents of the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa were determined by "the great Synagogue," which, according to a Jewish tradition, first added the books of Proverbs, Canticles and Ecclesiastes to the last division. Zunz, *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, Berlin, 1832, p. 14, n. b. Cf. Kehl, §§ 156 ff.

Meanwhile religion assumed a more personal character, and

The cessation of prophecy and the formation of the Canon were accompanied by other changes in the personal life of the Jews, not less important than these, and closely connected with them. The Prophets had spoken of a "new Covenant," and of an inward worship of the heart, with ever-increasing clearness. The position of the people helped them to accept the lesson. In exile, far from the sanctuary, they had learnt, as never before, the power of prayer.[1] The simple religion of Moses had become impossible; and, on the other hand, contact with Persia, which stands out from all ancient nations in the simplicity of a spiritual worship, naturally led them to realize the purity of their faith, and idolatry passed away forever from among them. The removal of this peril opened the way to a further extension of their divine knowledge. The time was come when they could contemplate without peril the contending powers of an unseen world; and the doctrine of spirits of good and evil took shape, not as a foreign accretion, but as a seasonable development of their first faith.[2]

the view of the spiritual world was widened.

(c) Social organization. The hierarchical element prevailed from

Outwardly, however, the great change in the Jewish nation after the return was the predominance of the hierarchical element in the state. But it was a hierarchy of education, and not of caste. The records and the institutions of Judaism were regarded as the hallowing power, and not the class to whom the administration of them was committed. In the absence of direct prophetic teaching public worship became the witness of God's presence, and the

The famous tradition of the restoration of the lost books by Ezra is but an exaggerated version of the work of collection which really dates from him. 4 Ezra xiv. Iren. adv. Hær. iii. 21, 2 (25), etc.

The existence of the great Synagogue itself has been called in question on insufficient grounds. Cf. Jost, *Gesch.* i. 438–50; Ewald, iv. 191; and p. 54, n. 1.

1 Ewald, iv. 30; and on the removal of the ark, p. 197, n. The great assembly introduced daily prayers: Zunz, a. a. O. p. 31. Etheridge, *Hebrew Literature*, p. 93 ff.

2 Cf. Ewald, iv. 207 f.

requirements of the Law were extended with scrupulous exactness to the details of private life. Two important changes in ritual signalized the new order of things. The "dispersion" was recognized by the creation of synagogues:[1] the close of the prophetic era by the stated reading of the Law.[2] From these necessary innovations other results flowed, which exercised an important influence upon the character of the people. The anxious and excessive zeal which led men to limit and overlay the freedom of daily conduct by religious observances, tended to invest a select body of teachers with almost absolute power. Thus the "scribes" soon rose above the priests, and with them tradition supplied the place of literature. The same result was further strengthened by the services of the Synagogue. The reading of the sacred text was necessarily attended by a vernacular paraphrase (*Targum*), oral, indeed, yet formed according to strict rules, and handed down in regular succession.[3] Thus schools of biblical learning grew up around the synagogues, and the members of these passed naturally into the great council of the nation (συνέδριον, γερουσία), or into the provincial assemblies which were framed upon the same model.[4]

the growing regard to the Law, and the character of the service of the Synagogue.

1 The exact date of the institution of synagogues cannot be determined. Possibly Ps. lxxiv. 8 may be a reference to them, and in that case their existence shortly after the return would be established; and this is on many grounds the most reasonable belief.

The importance of the institution as marking the new stage of tradition is recognized in the use of the Synagogue (as opposed to *Church*) for the whole outward constitution of Judaism (Lutterbeck, *Die Neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe*, Mainz, 1852, 1. 159).

2 The traces of the public reading of the Law are as obscure as those of the existence of a primitive Canon. The custom was attributed in part to Moses, and having existed partially at least under the kings, was established on a firm basis by Ezra. Lessons from the prophets were added in the time of the Maccabees; and at a much later period passages from the Hagiographa were introduced into special services of the Babylonian Synagogue. Zunz, a. a. O., pp. 3—7.

3 Zunz. a. a. O. pp. 7, 8. Cf. Chap. II. (ii) (β).

4 The Sanhedrin probably existed from the time of the return, and seems to have been formed on the model of the Mosaic council (Numb. xi. 16). During the Persian period the attention of its members would be naturally turned to internal affairs; and Ewald's conjecture (iv. 191) seems most just that the traditions of "the great assembly"

The dangers of the period.

But the very zeal with which the people sought to fulfil the Law, contained the germ of that noxious growth by which it was finally overpowered. For there was a darker side to the prospects of the Jews though their old perils were conquered. Not only was the integrity of their national character endangered, but they were exposed to the subtle temptation of substituting formulas for life. Hence arose the necessary reäctions of dogmatism and skepticism; hope strengthened into affirmation, doubt descending to denial. Meanwhile the fresh joy of life was sinking under the pressure of superstition; and as the saddest symbol of the direction in which they were turning, the people of God shrank from naming Him who was their strength.[1]

The general character impressed on the Literature, and

The scanty remains of the literature[2] which may be referred to the Persian period reflect in fragmentary images the characteristic features which have been noticed in it. The latest writings which were received into the Hebrew Canon are rather results of the former teaching of the nation by the Law and the Prophets than new elements in its progress. They were essentially *Holy Writings* (*ἁγιόγραφα, Kethuvim*), and not fundamental or constructive, the expression and not the spring of a Divine life. In the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, it is possible to trace a special purpose in the prominence given to ritual observances. In Esther it might seem that we have a simply human narrative,

really refer to the first Sanhedrin. The greater political activity of the council in the Grecian period is a sufficient cause for the adoption of the Greek title and the separation of the two councils. The earliest allusion to the Sanhedrin has been found in a fragment of Hecatæus (Joseph. c. Apion. i. 22) referring to c. B. C. 312 (Raphall, *Hist. of Jews*, i. p. 86, fr. Frankel's *Monatschrift*, Nov. 1851, p. 48).

1 Wie der Volksname sich mit jeder der drei grossen Wendungen dieser Geschichte ändert (Hebräer; Israel; Judäer) und jeder als kurzes Merkmal des ganzen Wesens der besondern Wendung gelten kann, ebenso und noch mehr der Name Gottes; aber nichts ist bezeichnender als dass auf dem einfachen aber hocherhabenen *Jahve* der prachtvolle *Jahve der Heere* mit dem sehr frei gebrauchten Jahve, auf diesen endlich ein . . . . folgt. Ewald, iv. 224.

2 Though the remains of the literature are small, the wise man complains of the multitude of books. Eccles. xii. 12.

were it not for that under-current of faith which refers all to the Providence of Him whose name is never mentioned. The later Psalms are a softened echo of the strains of David, and not new songs; hymns for the ordinary service of the Temple, and not deep searchings of the heart. In Ecclesiastes, again, the sublime questionings of Job pass into rhetorical arguments, directed to calm the bitterness of outward suffering rather than to fathom the deep riddles of humanity.[1]

the traditional estimate of the time.

The spirit of the period was rightly appreciated by those who ruled it, and finds its true expression in the three principles which are attributed to the men of "the Great Assembly:" "Be discreet in judging; train up many scholars; make a hedge around the Law."[2] The difficulties of social and national life, the conflicting interests of ruler and subject, the anxious effort to realize in practice the integrity of state and citizen, when both were imperilled by foreign supremacy, are attested by the first command, which could never have occupied such a place in a land of settled government and certain independence. The second command points to the true source of strength in an age of transition and conflict. The evils of doubt and dissension are best removed by the extended knowledge of the principles embodied in the state. In proportion as the different classes of the Jewish people were instructed in the writings of Moses and the prophets, priestly usurpation on the one hand, and popular defection on the other, became impossible. The third command alone contains the warning of the coming end. The fence was necessary, because the Law was not

1 Ewald places the composition of Baruch and Tobit at the close of the Persian period (pp. 230, 233), but they seem to belong to a later time.

2 *Aboth*, i. 1. Cf. Ewald, iv. 219. Raphall, *Hist. of Jews*, i. 118 ff., where a somewhat different explanation of the three commands is quoted from Frankel's *Monatschrift*, vi.

The *Pirke Aboth* has been published with a German translation and commentary by Dr. A. Adler, Fürth, 1851 (2 Pts.), and also by R. Young, Edinb. 1852. It is the most important record of Jewish thought during the whole period, and the short maxims which it contains, if written at length, are history.

only fixed, but dying. Religion already seemed capable of being defined by rule; duty had ceased to be infinite. Stern uprightness, devotion to the law, scrupulous ritualism, — all springing from a heroic faith and tending to a lifeless superstition, — such were the characteristics of the city which on the frontier of the East awaited with undaunted courage the approach of the conquering hosts of Alexander.

2. The Grecian period. The Jews were prepared for the conflict with Greece.

Inwardly as well as outwardly the Jewish nation was at that time prepared to support the antagonism of Greece. The people had comprehended their relation to the world, and the bold expression of the national faith was the motto of the last teacher of the great assembly. Simon the Just said, "The world (*Olam*) hangs on three things: the law, worship,[1] the practice of philanthropy."[2] And it was by the strength of this faith that Jerusalem stood unshaken when Tyre fell.[3] In addition to the lively consciousness of a spiritual mission yet to be fulfilled, the Jews found ready defences against the special dangers which were involved in Grecian rule. The belief in the absolute unity of God was so firm that the subtlest form of polytheistic worship could no longer endanger its integrity. The theocratic aspect of nature was so universal that the refinements of pantheism could scarcely make their charms felt. Ritualism was so deeply inwrought into common life that the teaching of philosophy could at best only gain a hearing in the schools. The work of the Eastern world in training a chosen people was perfected; and it was reserved for Greece to bring the bold teaching of reason and nature into contact with the rigid forms of truth which constituted the centre of the old Dispensation, as it remained for Rome in after time to present the image of a

1 *Avodah*, i. e. *service*, *worship*, *work*: The old commentators agree in referring it here to the Temple worship of sacrifice.

2 *Aboth*, 2. Adler gives a general interpretation to the maxim. The world — life in its fullest development — rests on (1) Doctrine, that is spiritual religion; on (2) the service of God, that is practical religion; on (3) love, as the spring of action.

3 Ewald, p. 250.

kingdom of the world raised upon the foundation of civil law and social freedom, in significant contrast with that kingdom of God, of which the children of the prophets failed to recognize the extent and comprehensiveness.

Alexandria the common meeting-ground.

The introduction of this new element into Jewish life brings with it, in part at least, a change of scene. The storm of conquest and the vision of empire passed away, but the true work of Alexander was perpetuated in the city which he chose to bear his name; and which remains after two thousand years the common portal of the East and West. Greek, Roman, Byzantine, Arab, ruled in turn, but Alexandria retained under every dynasty that same catholic character which its founder symbolized by placing the temple of Isis side by side with the temples of the gods of Greece.[1] Alexander prepared a stage in which ample scope and opportunity was given for every combination of thought and feeling; and men were found to occupy it. The teaching of Philo, Origen, and Plotinus was able to leave its individual impress on the three greatest forms of religious faith.

A new centre of Judaism.

A large colony of Jews formed a part of the original population of the new city; and, after more than a thousand years, the descendants of "Pharaoh's bondmen" returned to the land of their bondage. A second time, according to the old conceit, Israel was preparing to spoil Egypt, now of her intellectual as before of her spiritual heritage, while the colony grew up in the enjoyment of perfect freedom, under the continued influence of the Greek language and literature. For some time the mutual influence of the Churches of Jerusalem and Alexandria was intimate and powerful. Afterwards, from political and social causes, the separation grew wider, till the foundation of the temple at Leontopolis completed the schism. Yet even thus the ancient intercourse was not broken off. No beacon-fires announced in Egypt the due time of celebrating the new moons,[2] as

1 Arrian, iii. 1. 2 Cf. Mishna, Rosh Hashn. ii. 234.

determined by the Sanhedrin, but still the great body of the Alexandrine Jews paid the tribute to the Temple. Jerusalem was still regarded as their mother-city;[1] and when the famous synagogue at Alexandria was destroyed in the reign of Trajan, it was said that "the glory of Israel was extinguished." From this time Judaism acknowledged another centre; and three great streams flowed from Alexandria, Babylon and Jerusalem, which carried the name and faith of the God of Israel through Africa, Asia, and Europe.

The return from Persia was in itself, as has been shown already, the beginning and the preparation of a dispersion: the Greek invasion opened the way to its fulfilment, and Greek rule neutralized the evils by which it was attended.

The Dispersion at once political and

The liberal policy of Alexander towards the Jews was imitated by his successors, and the progress of their dispersion was consequently accelerated.[2] Ptolemy, it is said, placed Jewish soldiers in occupation of Egyptian and African strongholds, in addition to those whom he carried with him after his conquest of Jerusalem, and more particularly founded the Jewish colony at Cyrene. Seleucus Nicator about the same time admitted Jews to the full citizenship of the numerous towns which he founded throughout Asia Minor and Syria, and Antioch became the seat of an important Jewish settlement. At a later period, Antiochus the Great transferred two thousand Jewish families from Babylon and Mesopotamia to the disturbed districts of Lydia and Phrygia to secure their loyalty. On the shores of the Caspian and in the highlands of Armenia the Jews increased in number and influence under the protection of the Parthian dynasty. From Egypt they penetrated into Abyssinia, and probably into Arabia; and at last — to anticipate one detail — the work of dispersion was completed

1 Philo, c. Flacc. § 7.

2 Cf. Ewald, pp. 267 ff.; Raphall, ii. 64 ff., who quotes Frankel, *Monatschrift*. Dec. 1853. Merivale, *Romans under the Empire*, iii. 361 ff.

when Pompey carried with him to Rome a train of Jewish captives.

commercial.

Meanwhile the influence of commerce was not less powerful than the constraint of policy in scattering the Jews wherever civilization had penetrated. The power of the Greek arms and the Greek language laid open new paths on every side, and Jews followed the conquerors not only as soldiers but as merchants. Energy characterized their efforts in the one case no less than fidelity in the other, and the wealth which rewarded their industry secured them independence and respect. But the tendency of this dispersion of commerce was more perilous than the dispersion of war. The forces which were sufficient to support the people in their first conflict were weakened by subdivision. Everywhere they were mingled with the heathen population, and yet they were doubly isolated; for as their religion divided them from their follow-citizens, so the ties of their common nationality were weakened by foreign habits. The political divisions which followed the captivity were multiplied a thousandfold, and Judæa itself was gradually yielding to the influence of Greece when the precipitate fury of a persecutor finally concentrated the spirit of the people in absolute and heroic devotion to the law of Moses.

Reconciled with a true unity.

The persecution of Antiochus averted the great outward peril by which the Jewish people were threatened from the West. Sympathy was quickened throughout the whole body, and directed to one centre. The dispersion was reconciled with a real unity when the Law was felt to supply the want of a fatherland. The lesson which was first taught at the return was completed; and the Church finally assumed the place of the nation.

The internal history of

The independence, not only popular but personal, which was in the end the result of the Greek conquest, deeply affected the whole internal condition of Palestine. The law became the vital centre of a wide-spread Church, but the Church

itself was no longer absolutely one. Distinct sects were formed when the example of Greece had prepared a new way to speculation; and according to tradition terrible portents preceded the change. After the death of Simon the Just, it is said, the scape-goat no longer perished among the rocks, but escaped into the wilderness. The western light of the golden candlestick, which had always burned brightly, was now sometimes extinguished. The fire upon the altar languished. The blessing upon the show-bread ceased.[1] Antigonus of Socho, the first among the doctors who bears a Greek name,[2] marks the beginning of this era, and tradition describes him as the first of the Tanaim. The motto in which his doctrine is summed up is, as it were, an epitome of the coming controversy, combining the antithetical principles which were afterwards dissevered. "Be ye not as servants who serve their Lord for the sake of a reward, but as servants who serve their Lord without looking for a reward; and let the fear of Heaven be upon you."[3] The first clause offers a protest against the unworthy superstition of a ceremonial righteousness; the second reproves that proud confidence in self which follows on the first liberation from legal service. The two distinct truths which lay at the root of Pharisaism and Sadducæism are recognized together, and each excludes the exaggeration of the other. The historical position assigned to Antigonus is in exact harmony with his teaching. He is said to have been the scholar of Simon the Just, the last member of the great Synagogue, and the master of Sadoc and Boethus, the founders of Jewish rationalism.[4] The teacher now rises from the Church. Hitherto there had been no schools of

(a) The Jews in Palestine during i. The Greek supremacy. The rise of sects.

1 Prideaux, *Connexion*, ii. 2, fr. Jerus. Talm.

2 Zunz, p. 36.

3 *Aboth*, 3. This is said (Adler, p. 32) to be the first instance of the use of *heaven* for *God*.

4 The story (from the *Aboth* of R. Nathan) is given by Raphall, i. 161. Socrates, it will be remembered, numbered both Antisthenes and Aristippus among his scholars.

faith, no famous *men;* but at length individual feeling found its peculiar expression no less in thought than in action.

Sadducæism was the first and boldest expression of the growing passion for freedom. But the type of freedom was sought in Greece, corrupted by luxury and skepticism, and not in the prophetic pictures of the spiritual Israel. After the first assertion of man's absolute independence, a doctrine which contained implicitly all the subsequent tenets of the school, the influence of the Sadducees on Judaism was purely negative. Their existence was a protest against the sufficiency of the Pharisaic system; but they offered nothing to replace it.

Sadducees (freedom).

While some sought freedom, others, as is always the case, strove to exclude the possibility of its operation. The rise of Sadducæism was coïncident with a reäction in favor of tradition. The Pharisees claimed to possess exclusively the full perfection of the Law; and though the spirit by which the ancient writings were dictated passed away, the form in which they were cast still moulded the oral supplements[1] which were added to complete them. The *Halaka* and the *Haggada* — the Rule and the Word — represented in their general scope the Law and the Prophets; and the primary *Midrash* (Interpretation) united precept and exhortation at once with one another and with Holy Scripture.[2] But no claim

Pharisees (ritualism).

1 The best authorities for early Hebrew literature are: Zunz's *Gottesd. Vortr. d. Juden*, already quoted, which stands alone for critical accuracy and completeness within its peculiar range; Steinschneider's article *Jüdische Literatur*, in Ersch and Gruber's *Encyclopædie* (which has been revised and published in English by the author); Ethridge's *Hebrew Literature*, London, 1856, a very unpretending and useful summary. Hirschfeld's *Geist der Talmudischen Auslegung der Bibel*, Berlin, 1840, is very diffuse and deficient in clearness. Cf. note at the end of the chapter.

2 As these words are of frequent occurrence, it may be well to trace their meaning once for all.

(1) The general word for Biblical interpretation in its widest sense (cf. Aben Ezra *ap. Buxtf. s. v.*) is *Midrash* (fr. *darash*, to *investigate* and *interpret*). Hence also an exposition or allegorical interpretation is called *Darûsh* (*the result of inquiry*): the teacher generally *Doresh*, *Darshan* (*interpreter*); and the school *baith hammidrash*.

was made to original divine legislation. It was said that an oral Law had been given on Sinai, and that this which had been handed down in due succession from the time of Moses, when explained by the sayings of the great teachers, constituted the necessary supplement to the written Law, and completed a perfect code of life, of equal and paramount authority in all its parts. It was the work of the Sopherim to collect, of the Tanaim to arrange the substance of this oral Law. Nor was this done hastily. The first formal classification of the contents of the *Torah shebeal Peh* — the *Law that is upon the lip* — is attributed to Hillel; and the six Orders (*Sedarim*) which he distinguished formed the basis of the work of Akiva and Jehuda, when at length, at the end of the second century, the Mishna — the repetition of the Law — was committed to writing.[1]

The word occurs 2 Chron. xiii. 22; xxiv. 27. Gesenius gives *to rub* as the radical meaning of the verb: cf. Ges. *Thes. s. v.*

(2) The practical precept is *Halaka*, a *step*, a *rule*, from *halak*, *to go*, hence *to spend one's life*, *to live*. The comparison of *derek* (*via*, *vita*, *cultus*) shows clearly how *a step* would naturally express a detached principle of life. The cognate form *halikah* (only in pl.) occurs trop. Prov. xxxi. 27.

(3) The narrative, extending from the legend to the homily, is *Haggada*, *Aggada*, from *nagad*, Hiph. *Higgid*, to *tell*, *relate*.

Hirschfeld (*Der Geist der Talmud. Auslegung*, p. 13) gives a different, and, I think, an erroneous, explanation of the words: *halakah*, *iteratio*, von *halak*, das Nachgehen, Folgen einer Vorschrift, Mithalten, und "der Parthei sein." *Haggadah*, *dicta*, *sermones*, von *nagad* sprechen, erzahlen, meinen, — Meinung.

1 The precepts of this oral law, in allusion to their supposed source, were called *halacoth leMosheh meSinai* (*precepts of Moses from Sinai*). This was the original *kabbala* (*tradition*), a name applied to the writings of the prophets (Steinschn. l. c. p. 361). For centuries this law was preserved by memory or in *secret rolls* (*megillath setharim*). At the end of the second century, when the consequences of the defeat of Barkokeba threatened the utter dismemberment of the Jewish nation, it was committed to writing by R. Jehuda (†191 A. C.), and, being embodied with other materials, in six *Sedarim* (*orders*) under the name of the *Mishna* (*shanah*, to *double*, *repeat;* the word *mishneh* occurs for *a copy* (of the law), Deut. xvii. 18; Josh. viii. 32), has remained the central point of all later tradition. Round the *Sedarim* of the Mishna a *complement* of discussions (*Gemara; Gamar*, to *complete*) was gradually formed, and the whole was completed at Babylon in 498 A. C. The study of the *Mishna* and *Gemara* was properly called *Talmud* (*lomad*, to *teach*), and this name was applied to the works themselves. A second *Gemara* (extending to four of the six orders) was formed in Palestine, about the end of the fourth century; and this, in combination with a text of the Mishna, slightly differing from the Babylonian, forms the Jerusalem Talmud.

The popular influence of this secondary Law is everywhere visible in the Gospels. It is absolutely authoritative, and yet absolutely definite. The tradition of the elders claims the obedience of the faithful; and "to teach with authority" — with independent power — is contrasted with the teaching of the scribes.[1] But in itself the recognition of such a code marks a crisis of religious feeling. As long as the charter of faith is felt to consist in living principles, capable of being clothed in ever-varying forms, no change can render it obsolete or inadequate. If, however, its terms are once fixed by some temporary interpretation, at the first revolution of thought or position it is found antiquated and insufficient, and that help is sought from tradition which really can be found only in the vitality of the original Law. To invoke tradition as an independent authority is to proclaim that the first Law is dead.

The influence of tradition.

Between the false freedom of the Sadducee and the ritualism of the Pharisee a third course lay open. The Essenes sought rest in a mystic asceticism which promised freedom by the conquest of sense, and true worship in the substitution of the spiritual for the material.[2] Like similar reformers in every age, they began by asserting the sovereignty of God to the exclusion of man's freedom.[3] Jews by race, they

Essenes (asceticism).

1 R. Eliezer boasted that he had never said anything which he had not heard from his teacher. (Steinschneider, a. a. O. 364.)

2 The relation in which the three parties stand to another is a sufficient proof that it is unnecessary to seek the origin of the Essenes in any foreign society. The triple tendency ever exists in men, and in times of strong religious feeling will find an outward expression, in each case partial and exaggerated, and approaching more or less closely to the corresponding developments of other periods. The Palestinian origin of the Essenes is rightly asserted by Hilgenfeld, *Die Jud. Apok.* 245 ff. Alexandrine and Pythagorean influences may have modified the details of the society in the course of time; but the resemblance of the Essenes, Therapeutæ, and Neo-Pythagoreans, are explicable on other grounds.

The derivation of the name is uncertain. Many deduce it from *asa*, *to heal*. Hilgenfeld proposes *Hazin*, *Hozim*, *seers*, which is supported by Suidas s. v.

3 Joseph. Antiq. xiii. 5, 9.

found their chief bond of union in mutual love, as members of a society rather than citizens of a nation.[1] The institution of celibacy and the community of goods reduced the relations of their domestic life to the simplest form; but each detail assumed something of the solemnity of worship. Though ascetics, they did not wholly fly from the business and society of men, but, living in scattered communities, they offered a public testimony to truth, justice, and purity.[2] At the same time, by varied fastings and lustrations, and by the study of the sacred books,[3] they aspired towards a closer communion with the unseen world, and claimed to retain among them the gift of prophecy; and "it is rarely," Josephus adds, "that they are found to err in their predictions."[4]

The Pharisees and Essenes connected by an anxious legalism, which appears in

The school of the Essenes, however different in its final shape from that of the Pharisees, yet sprang from the same causes. A feeling of distrust in life, a faithless unwillingness to tread in the old paths, a craving after the protection of a stern discipline, at the same time a zeal prepared for any sacrifice, found satisfaction in the minuteness of an oral law, or in the self-devotion of a religious rule.[5]

1 Joseph. Bell. Jud. ii. 8; ([Hippol.] Philos. ix. 18 ff.). Cf. Antiq. xviii. 2; xv. 10, 4. Philo, *Quod omnis probus liber*, §§ 12 f.; *Apol.* fr. ap. Euseb. Prep. Ev. viii. 11; Plin. H. N. iv. v. 17. The first passage contains the authorities for what I have stated, unless a direct reference be given.

2 Hilgenfeld (a. a. O. p. 259 *anm.*) seems to give rightly the sense of Joseph. B. J. ii. 8, 4: "They have not one city, but many dwell together in each [of their communities]" (as below ἐν ἑκάστῃ πόλει τοῦ τάγματος). The words thus become consistent with those of Philo and Pliny; but the reading in Hippolytus, μετοικοῦσι, om. τοῦ τάγματος is more favorable to the common reading. Some Essenes even regarded marriage as a duty (Joseph. B. J. ii. 8, 13).

3 Βίβλοις ἱεραῖς . . . . καὶ προφητῶν ἀποφθέγμασιν. The τὰ τῶν παλαίων συγγράμματα (§ 6) seem to have included more than the books of Scripture. (Cf. Hippol. ix. 22.) The Essenes had also private books: τὰ τῆς αἱρέσεως βιβλία (§ 7).

4 He quotes three examples: Antiq. xv. 10, 5; Bell. Jud. i. 3, 5; ii. 7, 3

5 The Essenes "reverenced the Lawgiver next to God," and their observance of the Sabbath was most scrupulous (Joseph. l. c.). They offered sacrifices (θυσίας ἐπιτελοῦσι) also; but not at Jerusalem (Joseph. Antiq. xviii. 2). Philo, however, says (p. 457 M.), θεραπευταὶ θεοῦ γεγόνασιν οὐ ζῷα καταθύοντες . . . .

The Book of Ecclesiasticus, the sole relic of the Palestinian literature during the Greek supremacy, is marked by the traces of this anxious legalism.[1] Life appears imprisoned in endless rules, and the teacher strives to restore its cheerfulness. Subjection and humility are among the first virtues.[2] Knowledge is hidden in proverbs and confined in schools. To unriddle dark sayings is the duty of the wise man, though it be "a wearisome labor of the mind." He who "sees a man of understanding will get betimes unto him, and wear the steps of his door."[3] The renown of the scribe is of all the most brilliant and the most enduring.[4] To give glory to the priest is coupled with the showing fear towards God.[5]

Ecclesiasticus, and still more in

The sayings of the later doctors are still more impressed with the spirit of dependence. The stored mind of the teacher is the source of wisdom, and hope seems surest when it can be referred to old belief.[6] "Jose, the son of Joezer, of Zereda, said: Let thine house be the gathering-place of the wise. Dust thyself with the dust of their feet; and drink their words as a thirsty man." "Joshua, the son of Perachja . . . . said: Get for thyself a teacher; win for thyself a companion." . . . . "Abtalion said: Ye wise men, be careful in your discourse, lest ye be . . . . . cast into a place of bitter waters, and the scholars who come after you drink of them and die." . . . . "Hillel said: He who will make himself a great name, loses his name; he who increases not,

the traditional sayings of the doctors.

1 There can, I think, be no reasonable doubt that the translation was made c. 130 B. C., and that consequently the Hebrew original was written about 180 B. C. It seems probable that old materials were included in the original book, but I see nothing which may not be of purely Palestinian origin. Cf. Ewald, pp. 298 ff.

2 Ecclus. iv. 7; viii. 1, 8, 14; ix. 13; xiii. 2.

3 Ecclus. xiii. 2, 6; vi. 36.

4 Ecclus. xxxviii. 24; xxxix. 11. With this compare the corresponding praise of the Law: xxiv. 23—29.

5 Ecclus. vii. 29—31. At the same time the writer takes a wider view than common of the extent of God's providence: xviii. 13.

6 *Aboth*, 4, 6, 11.

decreases; he who learns not, is worthy of death; and he who makes use of the Crown [of the law for his own end] is lost."[1] "Shammai said: Make thy doctrine sure. Speak little and do much." ..... "Gamaliel said: Make to thyself a teacher. Relinquish doubtful points; and give not tithes often according to conjecture [but with strict accuracy]."

ii. The Hasmonean supremacy. A new impulse given to thought and writing.

For a time, however, the resuscitation of the national spirit supplied the loss of the ancient spirit of the prophets. The Maccabæan struggles, which averted the danger of a general assimilation of the people to their Grecian rulers, at the same time gave real life to the study of Scripture, and called out new forms of thought and writing. Hitherto the Law had concentrated upon itself the affection and hope of the Jews. Since the return they had been content to find in this the pledge and foundation of their national stability, anticipating a future which should only confirm and complete the character of the present. But now again, in the heat of contest and under the immediate consciousness of divine help, they felt that the end could not be consummated in a mere "judgment of the heathen," but fixed their eyes again upon the faded image of Messiah, and saw their fullest hope only through the strife and trials which should accompany His advent. In the moment of victory they knew that its issue was transient. The temporal glory of a conqueror was insufficient to satisfy the hopes of the nation, and Simon was appointed "ruler and high-priest forever until there arose a faithful prophet."[2] A corresponding change passed over their literature. The last echo of the prophets passed away in the Book of Baruch, the writer of which, after confession and reproof, describes in the magnificent imagery of Isaiah the future triumphs of Jerusalem.[3] But now

1 *Aboth*, 13, according to the translation of Adler: the Latin version of Surenhusius cannot be correct.

2 1 Macc. xiv. 41. Cf. iv. 46; ix. 27. Yet it is προφήτης, not ὁ προφήτης (John i. 21).

3 It is extremely difficult to determine the date of the Book of Baruch. Possi-

Revelation succeeded to the place of Prophecy. It seemed that the time was come when the veil might be raised from the counsels of God; and the seer pointed to all things working together for the immediate and final crisis.[1]

In addition to the "Revelations" of Daniel,[2] two Jewish Apocalypses still remain, the Book of Henoch and the so-called fourth Book of Esdras, which show with singular clearness in what way the writings of Daniel served as the foundation for later dreams. Both exist only in translations, but otherwise, as it appears, with few deviations from their original form. The former is evidently of Eastern, and probably of Palestinian origin, while the latter with equal certainty may be ascribed to Egypt. Both contain numerous data

a. Apocalypses. *Henoch.* 4 *Esdras.*

bly it was written shortly before or after the war of liberation; but on some accounts I should prefer an earlier date. The first part (i.—iii. 8) is evidently derived from a Hebrew original; and the Greek translator of this part probably added the conclusion (iii. 9—end).

1 A revelation (ἀποκάλυψις), with its specific purpose, its artificial plan, its symbolic imagery, its angelic ministrations, possessing at once the unity of a poem and the gorgeousness of a dream, is in itself the last step in the development of prophecy. It is also the most attractive form in which hope can be offered to a people which has learnt to feel even in the deepest afflictions that they form the turning-point of the world's history. But revelation differs from prophecy not only in the details of composition, but also in the point from which it contemplates the future, or rather the eternal. The Seer takes his stand in the future rather than in the present; and while the Prophet seizes on the prominent elements of good and evil which he sees around him, as seeds of the great "age to come," the Seer is filled first with visions of "the last days," and so passes from those to the trials of his time. In prophecy the divine and human—intuitive prescience and fragmentary utterance—are interwoven in one marvellous web. In "revelation" the two elements can be contemplated separately, each in its most active vigor, distinct predictions and elaborate art. As a natural consequence, "revelation" invites imitation as well by its artificiality as by its definiteness: its form is human, and its subject-matter limited and uniform. And thus, while few have ventured to affect the style of the ancient prophets, "Apocalypses" have rarely been wanting to embody the popular belief of those enthusiasts who, in all ages, antedate the final judgment of the world, and see in passing events nothing but certain signs of its near approach.

2 This is not the place to enter on the question of the date of the Book of Daniel in its present form; but I may be allowed to remark that the canonicity of the book depends on the judgment of the Jewish church, and not on the date of its composition. If it can be demonstrated that it belongs to the Maccabæan era, it remains just as much as before a part of Scripture, and a divine comment on history.

which seem to point to the period of their composition, but, at the same time, these are so ambiguous as to have received the most various explanations. Without entering into the details of the question, it appears most probable that the books were written at periods separated by about a century — Henoch during the later times of the Greco-Syrian empire, and Esdras when the power of Rome was everywhere dominant in the East, and Octavian undisputed master of the empire.[1] But however this may be, there can be no doubt that both Apocalypses represent purely Jewish notions; and dealing with the problems which Christianity solved, at no great interval from the time when the great answer was given, they yield in strange interest to few records of antiquity. Even in respect of style, as well as of substance, they repay careful study. The spirit of God's ancient people is indeed no longer clothed in the utterance of divine prophets, but it is not yet shrouded in a dress of idle fables. There are symptoms of increasing degeneracy and faithlessness in the later book; but when Henoch and Esdras were written, the words of inspiration were still powerful to rein the fancy and shape the visions of seers, and the wildest imaginings which they contain make little approach to the trifling of the Talmudists.[2]

b. Didactic narratives.

At the same time that prophetic hopes reappeared under the form of Revelations, prophetic history gave rise to those striking narratives of individual life, Tobit and Judith, which present the popular ideal of virtue, courage, and patience. For these the Book of Esther offered a Scriptural model, as that of Daniel for the Apocalypses and Ecclesiastes for the

1 The general character of the book at first sight suggests a date shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem, and this has been adopted by Gfrörer, Wieseler, and Bauer; but the description of the "three heads" (c. xi.) appears to point to the times of the Triumvirates. Cf. Hilgenf. 218 ff.

2 Compare, for instance, the allusion to Leviathan and Behemoth in Henoch lx. 7, with the well-known Talmudic legend. The Book of Esdras contains the legend in a transition state, vi. 49—52.

The Apocalypses of Henoch and Esdras will come under notice more particularly in the next chapter.

Books of Wisdom. Nor can it be unworthy of notice that the latest books in the Canon offer a complete parallel in theme and manner to the works which followed, while they are clearly distinguished from them even by outward marks of power and originality. As time advanced imagination supplied the place of vision, and fiction was substituted for history.

Tobit.

The Book of Tobit is at once the oldest, the most natural, and the most beautiful of the scenes of later Jewish life. The legalism of Jerusalem is softened down in the regions of the far East, and it would be impossible to find a more touching image of holiness and piety, according to the current type, than that of the Israelite captives of Nineveh. The various ties of family are hallowed by the presence of pure love. The righteousness of works appears in deeds of affection and mercy rather than in forms of simple ritual. The power of private prayer is exalted by its manifold success. The belief in the eternal purposes of God is firm and constant; and hope is proportionately clear and strong.

Judith.

The Book of Judith is conceived in a far different strain. The ordinary relations of a household are changed for the most terrible dangers of war; holiness in living for valor in daring. It was written apparently when a season of conflict was still impending, and the memory of deliverance still fresh. A woman, and she a widow, is able to overcome the captain of "the king of all the earth" by the power of the God of her fathers. "There is none that may gainsay her words" or her confidence; and why should Israel tremble before Syria? Faith can yet do what faith has done.[1]

1 Maccabees.

The first book of the Maccabees is the only Palestinian record of the heroic struggle which was inspired by such a hope, and is simple, natural,

1 The numerous recensions in which the Books of Tobit and Judith — like those of Esther and Daniel — exist, is a sufficient proof of the wide popularity which they enjoyed. Cf. Fritzsche, *Exeg. Handb. Einl. Tob.* §§ 3—8; *Jud.* §§ 2—5.

and accurate. The second book, of African origin, is more ambitious, and at times legendary; but both are destitute of that prophetic insight which elsewhere makes the chronicles of the Jews a commentary on the fulfilment of the Divine counsels.

2 Maccabees.

The relics of the ante-Christian literature of Palestine terminate[1] with the first Book of Maccabees; but meanwhile, the Jewish spirit in Egypt had not been inactive. The Greek Bible had preserved that real union with ancient Israel which the disuse of the Temple-service had threatened to destroy; and from the first the growth of independence and thought was more rapid among the Jews of Alexandria than among those of Palestine. The city itself was stamped with the impress of no distinct nationality, and controversy was inevitable in a place where every system found its representatives. But the Law and the prophets still continued to guide the philosophy of the Dispersion; and the Greek dress in which they were clothed prepared for after times the means of expressing intelligibly the principles of Christianity. The history of the LXX is obscure and perplexed.[2] So much, however, at least, is clear, that the Pentateuch was translated first, no long time after the first settlement of the Jews, and that the other books were added at various intervals before the middle of the second century B. C.[3] The character of the Alexandrine Church

(b) The Jews in Egypt. The Septuagint

1 The *Book of Jubilees* perhaps may be added, cf. Ch. ii. 1. (*d*). The Targums were rather the gradual embodiments of tradition than spontaneous literary works.

2 The work of Hody, *De Bibliorum Text. Orig.*, Oxon. 1705, is still the most important original investigation of the LXX. Frankel (*Vorstudien zu der LXX.*, Leipz., 1841) deals well with details of language and orthography. Grinfield (*Apology for the LXX.* London, 1850) pleads for the authority of the translation.

3 It is a coincidence too remarkable to be left unnoticed, that about the same time at which the translation of the Pentateuch was completed, Manetho, an Egyptian priest, published in Greek the first authentic account of the Egyptian history and religion, based upon the original records. Once again Egypt and Israel came in conflict. The writings of Callimachus illustrative of Greek mythology, and of Aratus on natural phenomena, belong to the same period. Cf. Carové, *Vorhalle des Christenthums*, Jena, 1851, p. 176.

has not failed to influence the translation; and, in some respects, it is rather an adaptation than a reproduction of the original. Even in the Pentateuch the traces of a growing refinement are discernible. The most remarkable anthropomorphic phrases are softened, and "the glory of the Lord" is substituted for His personal presence. Some preparation, at least, is made for the distinction of the Creator from Jehovah; and the narrative of the creation is moulded according to the current conceptions of a primary ideal world and of the constitution of man's nature.[1] The variations in the prophets are still more remarkable; and it seems difficult to explain the omissions which occur, except by the supposition of some intentional reserve in publishing the expected glories of Messiah.[2]

modified the original text, and

But the LXX performed a still greater work than that of extending a knowledge of Judaism to the heathen world: it wedded Greek language to Hebrew thought, the most exact form of expression with the most spiritual mode of conception. The intellectual vocabulary of the civilized world was claimed for religious use, and theology became a science. Active speculation followed as a necessary result. The gifts and promises of Revelation were compared with the faculties and wants of man. Traditional faith and new philosophy were examined and combined with various success; and the two events which mark the widest divergence of the Alexandrine from the Palestinian Jews belong to the same generation, and synchronize with the Maccabæan struggles. About the same time that the temple of Leontopolis was built, Aristobulus, a Jewish follower of Aristotle,[3]

fixed a theological dialect.

The growth of Hellenism.

1 Cf. Gfrörer, a. a. O. ii. ff. 8 ff.; Dähne, ii. i. ff. Frankel, 176 ff.

2 Grinfield, p. 74, with reference to Isai. ix. 6.

3 With regard to the development of Jewish thought at Alexandria, it is important to remember that the pursuit of philosophy was of late introduction, and that the form first current was the Peripatetic. Platonism was only a re-

gave the first real impulse to that mystical and Hellenizing tendency which was afterwards supposed to characterize the synagogue and church of Alexandria. The two facts mutually explain one another; for the growth of wider views of the purposes of the Law, and a more spiritual perception of its precepts, might seem to justify the abandonment of the literal Zion. The time was come, it was said, when there should "be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt," as the prophet had spoken; and when Egypt should be "blessed as God's people."[1]

Aristobulus.

The voice of Paganism itself was now boldly used to attest the supremacy of the faith of Israel. In his commentary on the books of Moses,[2] Aristobulus introduced a long Orphic quotation, which must have been cast in a Jewish shape either by himself or by some one of his countrymen. The adaptation — for it seems to have been an adaptation rather than a forgery — was not without excuse, and found abundant parallels. Orpheus seemed to stand apart from the later forms of polytheism in the depths of a mysterious antiquity, and thus the reminiscences of a patriarchal tradition could be attributed to him without unnatural violence.

The Jewish Sibyl.

In like manner the Sibyl occupied an independent position in the religion of Greece and Rome. If Orpheus represented the recipient of a primeval revelation, the Sibyl was an embodiment of the teaching of nature.[3] The writings of a Jewish or Chaldaic Sibyl contain probably the earliest fragments among the Sibylline

action against skepticism, which springs naturally from an exclusive study of the abstract or useful sciences. Cf. Matter, *Hist. de l'École Alex.* iii. 153 ff.

1 Isai. xix. 18, 19, 25. Joseph. Antiq. xiii. 3. Cf. Hieron. Comm. in Isai. v. 1. c.

2 Βίβλους ἐξηγητικὰς τοῦ Μωϋσέως νόμου, Euseb. H. E. vii. 32. The fragments of Aristobulus are preserved in Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* vii. 13, 14; viii. (8) 9, 10; xiii. 12. The passages quoted by Clement of Alexandria recur in Eusebius. The objections to the authenticity of the fragments are quite insufficient. Cf. Gfrörer, *Philo*, ii. pp. 71 ff; Daehne, ii. 73 ff; Ewald, iv. p. 294 n.

3 *Oracula Sibyllina . . . . recensuit . . . .* T. H. Friedlieb, Lipsiæ, 1852. Cf. Hilgenfeld, *Die Judische Apokalyptik*, Jena, 1857, pp. 53—90. The text, however, is still extremely corrupt. I have not seen Didot's ed., Paris, 1856.

verses; and the very fact of their existence and currency is a proof of the growing sympathy between Jew and Greek. "God," it is said, "dwells in all men, the test of truth in common light."[1] His people are no longer only ministers of His vengeance, — this office is reserved for the "barbarian rule" of Rome,[2] — but "they shall be guides to all men unto life."[3] The corruptions of heathendom are traced to their first source in the confusion of tongues; and the triumphs of the true faith are pursued till it becomes the religion of the whole earth, till "prophets are kings and judges of the world," and a heavenly peace is restored to nature and man.[4] In this respect the Sibylline writings stand alone as an attempt to embrace all history, even in its details, in one great theocratic view, and to regard the kingdom of the world as destined to form provinces in a future kingdom of God.

Philo.

The writings of Philo exhibit the maturity of Alexandrine thought, which was thus early directed to subtle allegory and wide hope. They bear few marks of originality or order, and must be regarded as the epitome and not the source of a system. Their characteristic is meditation and not thought; their source the accumulated treasures of the past, and not the opening of any new mine; their issue eclecticism, and not discovery. They may show how far men had advanced, but they open no way for future progress. Filled with the most profound belief in the divinity of the Jewish law, and not uninstructed in the philosophy of Greece, Philo endeavors to show the real unity of both, or rather to find in Moses the true source of the teaching of Plato and Aristotle. The spiritual instinct which had softened down the anthropomorphic language of the Pentateuch in the LXX translation, led Philo to explain away the traces of it which still remained. The divine Logos, at once the Reason and the

1 Prol. 18. Cf. iii. 262.
2 iii. 638, 520.
3 iii. 195.
4 iii. 781; 367 ff.; 784 ff. Cf. c. ii. pp. 89 ff.

Word of God, is brought into close and manifold connection with the world, while Jehovah (τὸ ὄν, rarely ὁ ὤν) is farther withdrawn from it. With the fullest consciousness of the work which the Jews had to discharge as teachers of mankind, Philo saw no way in which the work could be accomplished but by the perpetuation of the ordinances of the Law. He felt that the details of ritual were more than symbols of abstract ideas, but he found no antitype to substitute in their place. And thus while his spiritualism retained the restrictions of the old faith, it removed it from the reach of the simple. So far from "preaching a Gospel to the poor," it took away from them the outward pledge of it in which they trusted. Its tendency was to exalt knowledge in the place of action; its home was in the cells of the recluse, and not in the field or the market; its truest disciples were visionary *Therapeutæ*, and not apostles charged with a gospel for the world, debtors alike to Jew and Greek.

The Therapeutæ.

The society of the Therapeutæ[1] was indeed the practical corollary of Alexandrianism. The same tendency which had produced the society of the Essenes in Palestine found a new development on the borders of Lake Mœris. The discipline and occupation of these ascetics seemed to offer so clear an image of later monastic life that Eusebius claims them as Christians, and probably they furnished the model on which the first Egyptian communities were framed. They differed from the Essenes both in the objects of their pursuit and in the austerity of their rule. The examination of the deeper symbolism of Scripture was a congenial subject to those whose external position had long shut them out from the literal observance of the Law; and the open corruption of the court of the Ptolemies naturally called out the antagonism of an excessive self-denial. The active work which formed an essential part of the system of the Essenes, found no place in the cells of these Alexandrian devotees.

1 Philo, *De Vita contemplativa*, throughout.

For them the "whole day from sunrise to sunset was spent in mental discipline;" their one study was to investigate the inner meaning of their national philosophy contained in the "holy writings." The use of hyssop to give flavor to the ordinary diet of bread and salt and water was regarded as a delicate luxury. They sought only to appease the appetites, and not to gratify them. But the satisfaction of bodily wants was often forgotten in the pursuit of wisdom, and at all times "meat and drink" were held unworthy of the light. In one respect only they shared in common pleasures, when on their weekly vigil they recalled in sacred hymns and dances the great song of Moses and Miriam, adapting the rich resources of Grecian poetry and music to their divine themes.

The Book of Wisdom.

The Book of Wisdom is the noble expression of a mind which might have sought rest and joy in this meditative life; nor need it be a matter of wonder if the clearest foreshadowing of some of the truths of Christianity proceeded from such a source, if the attributes of the Divine Wisdom were gathered to something of a personal shape, and the workings of its powers extended to the whole world, by men who lived in the contemplation of God's dealings with mankind. Yet it is Wisdom, not the Word, and much less Messiah, which is exalted by the poet as "the creative, preserving, guiding power." To the recluse, far from the rude struggles of life, — from "the publicans and sinners" of a suffering world, — it might seem enough to paint the glories of wisdom and gaze forever on the picture, but Wisdom, cold and partial, could not be the truth for which creation was looking.

The general character of Alexandrianism.

For this last growth of Judaism, if the fairest, was still premature and fruitless. In its essence it was the ideal of heathen religion, and the negation of Christianity, because it raised the soul in isolation from the earth, and excluded all regard to the outer work of life and redemption. It was

equally partial in its application and in its scope. It addressed only one part of men's nature, and one class of men. It suppressed the instincts of civil and domestic society, which Christianity ennobled; it perpetuated the barriers which Christianity removed; it abandoned the conflict which Christianity carries out to victory. Yet even thus the mystics of Egypt and Palestine maintained a practical belief in the necessity of a spiritual faith. Their own existence was a sign of "the last times," but they could not interpret it. They witnessed that Judaism in its literal acceptation was insufficient to fulfil the desires of men; but they could not, like John the Baptist, proclaim the near approach of a coming kingdom.

Summary of the condition of the Jews.

The spirit of the Law and the Prophets had been embodied in every great typical form. The several phases of partial and independent development were now completed. Judaism had existed in the face of the most varied nationalities, and had gained an elasticity of shape without losing its distinctness of principle. But each concrete system which was substituted for the faithful anticipation of the Messianic times, led in the end to disappointment and confusion, and the scattered exiles were unable to spiritualize the nations among whom they sojourned. The hierarchy which seemed so full of life in the age of Ezra degenerated into a mere sect. The kingdom which had been thought to herald the final triumph of the nation ended in a foreign usurpation. The alliance with Greek philosophy had led, on the one hand, to an epicurean indifference, on the other, to an unpractical mysticism. But, meanwhile, the principles which lay at the basis of these partial efforts had gained a substantive existence, and were silently working in the whole people. The truths which had been felt once still lived even under the ruins of the systems which had been reared upon them. Law, freedom, thought, an intense national pride and a world-wide dispersion, a past bright with the glories of a Divine Presence, a present lost in

humiliation, a future crowded with pictures of certain triumphs, combined to fashion a people ready to receive and propagate a universal Gospel. A missionary nation was waiting to be charged with the heavenly commission, and a world was unconsciously prepared to welcome it.

The corresponding change in Heathendom.

A period of criticism.

The influences which had moulded the Jewish people during the last three centuries before the Christian era were not confined within that narrow circle. The age of Alexander was the culminating point of Greek thought as well as of Greek power. Afterwards the scholar occupied the place of the poet, and a period of criticism followed a period of creation. Aristotle, Pyrrhon, and Epicurus brought the last new elements into the system of ancient philosophy, and their successors combined, arranged, methodized, but opened no new ways of knowledge. The same interval which matured the fulness of Jewish hope served for the development of the final issues of Greek wisdom. And yet more than this: as the Jewish nationality was broken up by their wide dispersion, so the great tides of Western conquest swept away gradually the barriers by which the world had been divided, and colonization followed in the train of conquest. The citizen of Rome passed from province to province, and, if he borrowed the Greek language, it was to assert the Roman supremacy. As a necessary consequence, the power of paganism everywhere gave way. If philosophy had undermined its theoretical basis, national intercourse had weakened its practical effects. The life of paganism lay in its speciality. Pagan belief was in each case the religious expression of the particular spot, bound up with its character and history. Beyond its native limits its true vitality ceased, and all that remained was a spasmodic action. At the time when the Jew had discovered in his faith a germ of universality unknown before the dispersion, other religions were proved vain by their narrowness.

The dissolution of nationalities and of national religions.

The gods of Greece had faded away into dim shadows; and Rome, when once she left the borders of Italy, had no true gods, but admitted to a comprehensive Pantheon the deities of each conquered race. Throughout the West the religion of the state and the religion of the citizen were divorced. Faith was dying, and yet the desire of faith was evident: the old temples were deserted, and the wildest mysteries found eager votaries.

Meanwhile the Catholic powers survive: Greek literature and Roman right.

But if Greece and Rome failed alike to found a universal religion, they showed its possibility. Each in its turn had exerted a power capable of uniting all men by a moral influence. Greece had left a universal literature and language by seizing the general laws of beauty and thought. Rome had founded a universal empire by asserting with instinctive justice the great principles of right in her dependent provinces. The idea of a common humanity, transcending the differences of race and time, was outwardly established by the help of thought and law.[1]

And philosophy, by analyzing man's powers and instincts, prepared the way for their harmonious combination.

For the universal powers of Greek language and Roman right were not all which heathendom laid at the foundation of Christianity. The great work of Greek philosophy had been to distinguish the various elements which were confused in the popular idea of religion, that they might be prepared for a harmonious combination. Theology, morality, law, worship, have been so long and so clearly apprehended in their separate scopes, that it is often forgotten that they were once entangled in one complex notion. Step by step the great masters of antiquity advanced towards the truth which they divined. From the study of the universe they passed to the study of man, marking his varied relations, analyzing his distinct faculties, and asserting the manifold instincts by which he

1 Compare the marvellous description of the power of universal law (*quam M. Tullius pene divina voce depinxit*) quoted from Cicero by Lactantius, *Instit.* vi. 8 (Cic. *de Rep.* iii. 22).

is impelled, while it remained impossible to reconcile them. Partial truths obtained their boldest expression, freedom and fate, a life purely sensuous and a life purely intellectual, man's body enthroned and imprisoned, Epicureanism and Stoicism: such was the final contrast which St. Paul found at Athens, and which Christianity harmonized.

But philosophy could not solve the problem which it proposed.

Even in their negative aspect the results of systems, varied as the elements of human nature, were an important preparation for the Gospel, and were in themselves an exhaustive commentary on Natural Religion, defining the extent of its domain and the nature of its independence.[1] The central principle which should bind all men into one family and unite earth to heaven — if heaven indeed were — had been sought in nature, in individual reason, in civil life, and all that magians, philosophers, statesmen, had found were fair shadows, noble and bright at first, but which were changed into terrible spectres. The religions of the East had sunk into degrading superstitions and strange sorceries. The speculations of Greece had been directed into countless channels, all leading to blank skepticism. The organization of Rome was on the point of becoming the mere machinery of a military despotism. Everywhere idolatry had wrought out its fearful issues, and shameless wickedness had corrupted the streams of social life.

Nor was the case otherwise beyond the limits of the Roman Empire.

Nor can it be urged with justice that this picture of the exhaustion of ancient life ceases to be true if we look beyond the limits of the Roman Empire. The religions of India and Scandinavia contained no element capable of renovating a world; and as far as it is possible to penetrate the darkness in which their beginnings are shrouded, they appear to have fostered forms of corruption and barbarism more desolating than the paganism of the West. The

1 Let any one compare, for instance, Arist. de Anima, iii. 5, with 1 Cor. xv.

Northmen were gathering strength for a contest yet distant: the masses of Eastern Asia were in some sense condemned by nature to slavery. In one case civilization was not yet possible, in the other it was essentially defective. And in estimating the nature of an epoch it is sufficient to regard the great centres of civilization. The drama of history is ever enacted upon a narrow stage. Fresh characters enter and play their parts in due course, but till then they have no influence except through others. The world has its representative nations to whom its fortunes are entrusted, and who justly express its condition; and in this sense the Roman Empire at the beginning of the Christian era was no less truly than popularly identical with the civilized world.[1]

A solution sought in the Roman Empire; but

But in the midst of disappointment and exhaustion hope still lived. There was a vague presentiment abroad that a new period was drawing near; and the triumph of material power appeared to offer the blessings which Christianity realized. The birth of Augustus is said to have been accompanied by prodigies which declared him to be the future master of the earth, and old legends revived in his person.[2] Time appeared to fulfil the auguries. The beginnings of the empire gave promise of a government able to maintain the welfare of the world; and the lull of general peace by which it was ushered in was welcomed as the inauguration of the new era. The nations were gathered into one, and a ruler, such as the world had not seen, claimed them as his inheritance. At such a time even outward unity might well seem to promise secure happiness. The state, which was always the real object of a Roman's devotion, had found a personal embodiment; and the people were willing to concede to the emperor the divine titles which he claimed.[3] The stern image of might was decorated with

1 Ἡ *οἰκουμένη*.

2 Suet. Oct. c. 94. The whole chapter is very curious.

3 The climax was reached by Domitian, whose edicts ran: Dominus et Deus noster sic fieri jubet (Suet. Domit.

something of oriental splendor. The verses of the sibyl had already passed from Alexandria to Rome; and in painting the future the legends of the golden age were combined with the prophetic expectations of the East.

Hope still looked to the East.

For it was in the East that hope rested. The strange traditions of India and China are well known; but in their present form they seem to have received something of a Christian coloring, though the Jews must have carried with them in their dispersion the great outlines of their national faith.[1] In Palestine these outlines had been filled up in times of spiritual trial. The Messianic promises had grown purer and clearer by the ordeal of persecution and suffering; and the people which was of all the most despised cherished the noblest belief in the time of its distress. The Jew knew that a spiritual kingdom would come, of which the Roman Empire was but a faint and partial image; and by certain signs he felt its near approach. His view might be imperfect or distorted, colored by the hope of material triumph, or clouded by thoughts of vengeance, yet his eye was fixed heavenward, and he stood ready for the conflict. The spectacle is one of sublime interest; and to understand the fulness of the Jewish faith it is necessary to go back once more and trace the outlines of the Messianic hope as it was shaped, through long ages of discipline, after the age of the prophets had closed.

c. 13). Cf. Tac. Ann. i. 10. Salvador, *Hist. de la dom. Rom.* i. 334 ff.

1 Cf. Huc's *Christianity in China*, i. p. 11. Schlegel's *Philosophy of History*, p. 136 (Eng. trans.).

NOTE ON CHAPTER I.

The following slight synopsis of Jewish literature will serve as a clew to much that will be said afterwards. (Alexandrine writers and works are distinguished by Italics.)

3d Cent. B. C. ANTIGONUS of Socho.
The *Pentateuch* translated into *Greek;* the other books of the Old Testament at various times afterwards.
Baruch i.—iii. 8.
The *Septuagint* completed.

2d Cent. B. C. *ARISTOBULUS* (fragments).
Jesus the son of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus); Sepher Ben Sira perhaps contains fragments of the original book.
Tobit.
170 The Psalms of Solomon. (*Greek:* Fabr. *Cod. Pseud. V. T.* i. 914 ff.)
150 *Additions to Daniel and Esther.*
(?) Judith.
(?) *Baruch*, the present recension.
Jewish Sibylline Oracles.
120 The Apocalypse of Henoch. (Æthiop. trans.)
Ecclesiasticus translated into Greek.
(?) *The Wisdom of Solomon.*
EZECHIEL (fragments).
The elder *PHILO.*
The Book of Jason, on which 2 Macc. was based.

1st Cent. B. C. i. Maccabees (Greek trans.)
90 ii. *Maccabees.*
The Letter of Jeremiah.
(?) iii. *Ezra*, translation and revision of the Hebrew book.
iv. *Book of Maccabees.*
iv. *Ezra* (Æthiop. Ar. Lat. trans.)
(?) *Prayer of Manasses* (cf. Fritzsche, *Exeg. Hand.* 158).
iii. *Maccabees* (perhaps later).
HILLEL.
SHAMMAI.

1st Cent. P. C. Targum of Onkelos on the Pentateuch (Zunz, p. 62).
Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the Prophets (id. p. 62).
GAMALIEL.
PHILO (c. 20 B. C.—50 A. C.).
The Book of Jubilees (Æthiop. trans.).
JOSEPHUS (37—c. 100 A. C.).
AKIVA († 122 or 135).
R. MEIR.

2d Cent. P. C. xxxii. Middoth of R. Eliezer (Zunz, p. 86).
Megillath Taanith (fragm.) (id. p. 127).
Simon Ben Jochai.
Jehuda Hannasi, or Hakkodesh, or Rabbi († 190).
Elements of the Books Jetzira and Zohar.

3d Cent. P. C. Mishna.
Sifra debe Rab (on Leviticus), (Rab † 243).
Sifri debe Rab (on Numbers and Deuteronomy).
Toseftas (addenda) of R. Chija and R. Hoschaja.
Seder Olam (Zunz, p. 86).

4th Cent. P. C. Mechilta (on part of Exodus), (Zunz, p. 47).
Sifri Sutta (fragm. on Numbers), (Zunz, p. 48).
Malacath Hamashecan (id. p. 87).
Bereshith Rabba (= last five chapters, Zunz, pp. 174 ff.).
Jerusalem Gemara (Talmud).

5th Cent. P. C. Babylonian Gemara (Talmud).
498

CHAPTER II.

THE JEWISH DOCTRINE OF MESSIAH.

Οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς ἡμῖν δὲ διηκόνουν αὐτά. —1 ST. PETER i. 12.

The Biblical doctrine of Messiah in the patriarchal,

THE Book of Genesis connects the promise of Redemption with the narrative of the Fall.[1] At each crisis in the providential history of the world this promise was brought within narrower limits, and illustrated by fresh details. After the Flood, one of the sons of Noah was especially connected

1 The various works on the growth and form of the Jewish doctrine of the Messiah, particularly after the close of the prophetic era, seem to me to contain materials for a history of the doctrine rather than the history itself. Schöttgen (*Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ*, Dresd. 1733–42) has accumulated a most valuable collection of Jewish traditions, but apart from minor inconsistencies, he exhibits no critical perception whatever of the relative value of the authorities which he quotes, and often seems to me to misinterpret the real tenor of their testimony. The writers who have followed him have for the most part confirmed his errors. Nork (*Rabbinische Quellen* u. s. w. Leipzig, 1839), who has collected with fair accuracy the sum of Hebrew tradition, is most offensive and unjust in the use which he makes of it. Gfrörer (*Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, Stuttg. 1838) has given the best general view of the subject, but he is not free from the great faults of Schöttgen, which found their natural issue in Strauss's *Leben Jesu*. As a correction to these exaggerated pictures of the completeness of the Jewish doctrine of Messiah the remarks of Br. Bauer (*Kritik der Evang. Gesch.* Leipzig, 1846, i. 391 ff.) on the non-existence of any such clear doctrine, however exaggerated they may be on the other side, are worthy of consideration. Ebrard's answer (*Kritik der Evang. Gesch.* Erlangen, 1850, pp. 651 ff.) seems to me partial and inadequate.

Bertholdt's *Christologia Judæorum* (Erlangæ, 1811) possesses no distinctive or critical value, and Bp. Blomfield unfortunately relied upon him in his *Dissertation upon the traditional knowledge of a promised Redeemer* (Cambr. 1819) for the state of Jewish belief in our Lord's time. Hengstenberg's *Christology* (Eng. Tr. Edinb., 1856, vols. i. ii.) is rather a collection of criticisms on the Messianic passages of the Old Testament than a connected view of the doctrine; and the same remark applies to Pye Smith's *Scripture Doctrine of Messiah*. Lond., 1837.

with the future triumph of God.[1] Abraham was called, and the assurance was given to him that the blessing of the earth should spring from his seed. The fortunes of the twelve patriarchs were prophetically foreshadowed, and the sceptre was assigned to Judah. But up to this point no personal trait of a Redeemer was given.[2] Hope was turned from mankind generally to a race, a nation, a tribe; but, in accordance with the simplicity of early faith, it was left otherwise vague and distant.

Mosaic, and

The legislation of Moses contained the next revelation of "the great age to come," and the first description of the prophet by whom it should be inaugurated. The Law from the first exhibited the image of a nobler Law; and that which was permanent and essential in the relation which it established between God and man was transferred to a future Lawgiver. At the same time the hope of the world was definitely fixed in Palestine by the witness of a heathen seer. The promise of Moses was confirmed by the unwilling testimony of Balaam, who looked forward to the triumph of the Jewish race and the Jewish King, and condemned himself; just as, in after-times, Caiaphas admitted the necessity of Christ's sacrifice, and condemned his nation.

Regal periods.

The establishment of the kingdom gave an occasion for a further enlargement of the conception of Messiah's person and work, and a narrower limitation of the stock from which he was to spring. One family was selected from the chosen tribe; and the "sceptre" was now reserved for the Son of David. The later period of the kingdom saw the gradual unfolding of the idea of this future king. Human tyranny served to place in clearer light the fulness of Messiah's love; the idolatrous faithlessness of the people, the irresistible per-

1 Gen. ix. 27. The rendering of Onkelos, whatever may be thought of its correctness, makes this more clear: *Dilatet Deus Japheth; et habitare faciat gloriam suam in tabernaculis Sem.*

2 The doubtful term *Shiloh* (Gen. xlix. 10) cannot be urged against this view.

suasiveness of His teaching; the growing consciousness of sin, the efficiency of His priestly intercession.

In the Captivity.

The Captivity completed the circle of the Messianic hopes, by turning the eyes of the people to the divine glory of the coming King, and the universal extent of His dominion. The Son of David was recognized under the wider title of the Son of Man; and His kingdom appeared as the last and mightiest of the monarchies of the world.

General results.

In this way the earliest hope of mankind was centred in a Person; and the image of the future Saviour was drawn from the varied forms in which God made Himself known in the history of the chosen people. The same discipline which shaped their character chastened and ennobled their hopes. The old hope gave birth to a new one, and yet survived the transformation, because it was true, though partial; and at the close of the prophetic era three great Messianic types remained — the Mosaic, the Prophetic, the Apocalyptic — representative in some degree of the three periods of inspired teaching; and according as these different types were adopted exclusively or variously combined, the faith of later generations was dwarfed or enlarged.

The Apocryphal books silent as to Messiah, but

The Apocryphal books, as is well known, contain no reference to a personal Saviour. The first book of Maccabees records the decision of "the Jews and the priests, that Simon be ruler and high-priest forever (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα) till a faithful prophet arise;" but it seems doubtful whether there is any reference in these words to the great Prophet of whom Moses spoke, or to the forerunner of Messiah. The omission is probably due to the character of the books, and not to the absence of the hope, which is clearly expressed in other contemporary writings. Similar writings in the Old Testament (*e. g.*, Ezra, Nehemiah) contain no Messianic predictions; and the Book of Baruch, the only echo of the prophets which remained in the Maccabean age,

1 *Macc.* xiv. 41.

announces in ancient words the restoration and triumph of the chosen people.[1] "I will cause them to return [saith the Lord] to the land which I sware to their fathers, to Abraham, and to Isaac, and to Jacob, and they shall be lords over it; and I will multiply them, and they shall not be diminished; . . . . and I will no more move my people Israel from the land that I gave them."[2] "Take a good heart, O Jerusalem.[3] He that named thee shall comfort thee. Wretched are they that afflicted thee, and rejoiced over thy fall. Wretched are the cities to which thy children were in bondage. Wretched is the land that received thy sons. . . . . For fire shall come upon her from the Eternal for long days, and she shall be inhabited by evil spirits for the longer time. Look round to the East, O Jerusalem, and behold the joy which is coming to thee from the Lord. Behold thy sons are coming, whom thou sentest forth: they are coming, gathered together from the East to the West by the word of the Holy One, rejoicing in the glory of God. . . . . For God shall show thy brightness to every country under heaven. . . . . They went out from thee on foot, led by enemies, but God is leading them to thee, lifted up on high with glory, as children of the kingdom."[4] The same ideas recur in the Book of Tobit. The God who scattered them shall gather His people together again, "and bring them to their own land. And they shall build His house, not such as was the former house, until the seasons of the age (καιροὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος) be fulfilled;[5] and afterwards they shall return from the places of their captivity, and build Jerusalem gloriously."[6] . . . . . "Jerusalem shall be built with sapphire and emerald,[7] and her walls with precious stone, and her towers and battlements

contemplate a national restoration.

1 But the language used of the Law as eternal and life-giving (iv. 1), and in an especial sense a revelation of God's person (iii. 37 f.), is particularly worthy of notice.

2 ii. 34, 35.

3 iv. 30 ff.

4 The other reading, ὡς θρόνον βασιλείας, gives the same general sense, but the metaphor is very harsh.

5 Quoadusque repleatur tempus maledictionum. Vet. Lat.

6 xiv. 5.

7 xiii. 9 ff.

in pure gold; and the streets of Jerusalem shall be paved with beryl, and carbuncle, and stone of Ophir." . . . . "And all nations shall turn truly to fear the Lord God, and bury their idols; and all nations shall bless the Lord; and His people shall confess God, and the Lord shall exalt His people; and all who love the Lord God in truth and righteousness shall rejoice, doing mercy to our brethren."

The Messianic idea further developed, 1. in the Apocalyptic Literature.

But these wide anticipations of coming glory appear vague and incomplete when compared with the clear-drawn visions of that Apocalyptic literature[1] in which we must next trace the progress of the Messianic faith.

(*a*) The Sibylline Oracles. 160—140 B. C.

The earliest fragments of the Sibylline writings[2] which belong to the beginning of the Maccabean period, complete the picture of the national triumph by the recognition of the great Conqueror.[3] When the need of man is sorest, and pestilence and war are spread over the world; when king seizes king, and nation ravages nation, and rulers fly, and the earth is changed, and a barbarian power desolates all Greece; when the earth is unsown and unploughed, covered with the unburied dead,[4]—then it is said,[5] "God shall send from the sun a King, who shall cause every land to cease from evil war, slaying some, and fulfilling a faithful covenant with others. Nor shall He do all this by His own counsels, but obeying the high decrees of the mighty God. Then, again, the people of the mighty God shall be laden with noble wealth, with gold and silver, and with array of purple; and the earth shall bring forth to perfection, and the sea teeming with blessings. . . . . But, again, the kings of the Gentiles with gathered might shall assail this land, bringing fate upon themselves; for they shall

1 Cf. p. 93, n. 1.

2 Lib. iii. with the exception of vv. 1—96, 818—828, and one or two smaller interpolations. Cf. Hilgenfeld, a. a. O. 53 ff. Gfrörer, *Philo*, u. s. w. ii. 121 ff.

3 The best general introductions to the Apocalyptic writings are by Lücke (*Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes*, 2te Aufl. Bonn, 1852), and Hilgenfeld (*Die Judische Apokalyptik*, Jena, 1857).

4 Vv. 632—651. 5 Vv. 652 ff.

wish to ravage the fold of the mighty God, and to destroy the noblest men. . . . . But swords of fire shall fall from heaven, and on earth great flames shall come. . . . . and every soul of man and every sea shall shudder before the face of the Immortal. . . . . And then shall [the foes of His people] recognize the Immortal God, who brings these judgments to pass, and there shall be wailing and crying over the boundless earth, as men perish. . . . . But the sons of the mighty God[1] around His temple all shall live in quiet. . . . . for the Immortal is their defender, and the hand of the Holy One. And then shall all the islands and cities say: How does the Immortal love these men, for all things strive with them and help them. . . . . Come, let us all fall on the ground and entreat the Immortal King. . . . . Let us send to His temple, ... and all heed the Law of the Most High God. . . . . And then[2] shall God raise up a kingdom forever (εἰς αἰῶνας) over all men. . . . . And from every land men shall bear frankincense and gifts to the house of God. . . . . And prophets of the mighty God shall take away the sword, for they shall be judges of mortals and righteous kings. Rejoice, then, O Virgin, and exult; for to thee hath He given gladness forever who created heaven and earth. In thee [O Sion] shall He dwell; and for thee shall He be an Immortal Light."[3]

The defects of the Sibylline conception.

But even in these oracles the glory of the king is lost in the glory of the nation. The house of David is forgotten in the recollection of the theocracy.[4] The permanent establishment of the Law as the rule of the whole earth is the object of highest hope,[5] or second only to that final consummation of the world, when a fiery flood shall destroy all that is

1 Vv. 702 ff.

2 Vv. 766 ff.

3 The remainder of this passage (787—794) is a close imitation of Is. xi. 6—8. Cf. 367—380.

4 The only reference to the family of David is vv. 288-90, but the reference appears to be to Zerubbabel; and the king whom "God shall send from heaven, who shall judge each man in blood and flash of fire" (vv. 286-7), though he appears with the attributes of Messiah, can be no other than Cyrus.

5 Cf. vv. 573 ff.

corrupt and perishable in man and nature, and leave the good in eternal purity. "The people," it is said, "shall be guides of life to all mortals;[1]" but there is no mention of a spiritual covenant. There are no glimpses of a Gospel or of an Incarnation. The blessings of the future are drawn after the types in Deuteronomy, and the plagues which are denounced against the wicked recall the scenes of the Exodus and the conquest of Palestine.

Its further enlargement.

Still the belief in a Messiah is recognized, and the glorious future is connected with His advent. Nor is His descent from the Sun — the seat of the empire of light — the only sign of His divine nature. In a later fragment, which dates from the time of the last triumvirate, Messiah appears in contrast with Beliar, the great manifestation of the power of evil.[2] "A holy king shall come to hold the sceptre of every land, for all ages, as time hastes on. . . . . But forth from the people of Sebaste[3] shall Beliar come afterwards; and he shall plant the lofty mountains [in the valleys], and stay the sea, the mighty fiery sun, and the bright moon, and wake the dead, and perform many signs among men; but they shall not bring their promised end in him, but they shall be deceptive, and in truth they shall deceive many men (μέροπας), both faithful and chosen Hebrews, and also other lawless men, who have not yet heard the word of God. But when the threats of the mighty God draw near, a flaming power shall come in a billowy flood (δι' οἴδματος) upon the earth, and consume Beliar and all the haughty men who placed their trust in him. . . . . God shall roll the heaven as a book is rolled, and the whole spangled firmament shall fall on the glorious earth and ocean. A torrent of devouring fire shall flow unwearied, and consume the land, and consume the sea, and the firmament of heaven, and days; and creation itself it shall melt together, and

1 Ver. 195. 2 Vv. 49 ff.
3 This name must have been inserted afterwards (with a reference to Simon Magus, Sebaste = Samaria? or to Nero); for it could not have been used of the Romans before the death of Antony.

refine it and purify it (ἐς καθαρὸν διαλέξει). And no longer shall the laughing globes of the [heavenly] lights [roll on. There shall be] no night, no dawn, no many days of care, no spring, no summer, no winter, no autumn. And then shall the judgment of the mighty God come in the midst of the mighty age when all these things come to pass."[1]

(b) The Book of Henoch.

† 107 B. C.

Shortly after the first collection of Sibylline oracles was formed at Alexandria, the hopes of the Palestinian Jews were raised to the highest pitch by the successes of John Hyrcanus, only to be lost again in the rising conflict of sects, and the weakness and crimes of his successors. These alternations of joy and sorrow found their expression in the Apocalypse of Henoch.[2] No apocryphal book is more remarkable for eloquence and poetic vigor; and the range of subjects which it includes is as noble as its style. In its present form, the book aims at little less than a comprehensive vindication of the action of Providence, both in the physical and in the moral world. At one time it encourages men quailing before outward enemies; at another, it rebukes a people torn by inward divisions: now it offers an explanation of the mysteries of creation; and now it seeks the type of present dangers in the catastrophe of primeval history. It is probable that these different parts owe their origin to distinct authors, and that they were interwoven into the present book by a later compiler. But the distinction of the constituent elements is of comparatively little importance at present, since the book assumed a certain unity during its last revision, and offers a gen-

1 It is sufficient to refer generally to Matthew xxiv., 2 Thess. ii., Apoc. xx., for striking parallels to many of the thoughts in this passage.

2 *Liber Henoch, Æthiopice.* A. Dillmann, Lipsiæ, 1851. *Das Buch Henoch. Übersetzt und erklärt von* Dr. A. Dillmann, Leipzig, 1833. These two editions supersede those of Bishop Laurence: *The Book of Enoch*, etc., Oxford, 1821, 33, 38, and *Libri Enoch versio Ethiopica*, Oxon., 1838. Where the difference appeared to require notice I have given Laurence's rendering in brackets [L.] or in the notes. The editions of Hoffmann and Gfrörer have no independent value. Cf. Dillm. *Einleit.* pp. lvii. ff.

erally consistent view of the office of Messiah.[1] But while the whole book is thus impressed with a certain stamp of uniformity, the central portion, round which the other prophecies are grouped, glows beyond the other parts with a spiritual fervor, pure, intense, and passionate. If the deeper mysticism and colder speculations of the Apocrypha leave no place for the doctrine of Messiah; if the priestly and prophetic office of the great king was merged by the Sibyl in the prophetic office of the nation, in Henoch the Advent of Messiah is contemplated with a joyful and certain hope. The might and tyranny of heathen oppressors serve only to suggest the certain retribution and just vengeance which hangs over them; the victories which have been gained by the people of God are but a prelude to wider conquests. A judgment is reserved for sinners; a triumph is prepared for the righteous: and Messiah is the divine instrument of this twofold issue. Such is the message of "faith and truth"[2] which the voice of the ancient patriarch proclaims to a people conscious of their heav-

1 Ewald, in an admirable essay on the book (*Ueber d. Æthiop. B. Henoch Entstehung, Sinn u. Zusammensetz. Transact. of the Royal Soc. of Göttingen*, 1856, pp. 107 ff.), supposes that it consists of fragments of four books.

i. The first book, the original prophecy, written in a period of outward trouble and danger, during the first years of John Hyrcanus, c. B. C. 144, represented by capp. xxxvii.—lxxi. with some interpretations.

ii. The second book, written a few years later, when prosperity had given rise to internal schisms, c. B. C. 135, of which fragments occur i.—v.; vi. 1, 2; viii. 4; ix. 1—6, 8—11; x. 4—10, 12; xi. 2; xii.—xvi.; lxxxi. 1—4; lxxxiv.; xci. 4; cv.

iii. The third book, written a little later, c. B. C. 128, philosophical in character, as the first is poetical and the second rhetorical. Fragments of this occur, xx.—xxxvi.; lxxii.—lxxxii.; lxxxiii. 1—9; lxxxv.—xc; cvi.—[cviii.]

iv. The Book of Noah, occurring in scattered fragments, vi. 3—8; ix. 7; x. 1—3, 11; xi. 22; lxix. 2.; xvii.—xix.; xxxix. 1, 2^a; lx. 1—10, 24 f.; lxiv—lxix. 16. This book was written some years after the last.

The whole book of Henoch assumed its present shape, according to Ewald, during the first half of the century before Christ. I have given these details, not because I think it possible to accept a result so complicated, but because the divisions throw considerable light upon the internal structure of the book. Other theories of its composition may be seen in Hilgenfeld, a. a. O. pp. 95 ff. Perhaps all that can be affirmed with certainty is the later origin of the Noachian portions.

2 Cf. Dillm. p. 32; Ewald, p. 128.

enly mission and fresh from brilliant struggles, and yet trembling and divided.[1]

The introduction of the Messianic doctrine in Henoch.

The first introduction of the Messianic subject is marked by several peculiarities, which at once call attention to its importance. The Vision which contains the most complete portraiture of the coming Kingdom is emphatically the Vision of Wisdom; and this "beginning of Wisdom" is addressed to all "the dwellers on the earth, both those of old time, and those who shall come after." Even God Himself is addressed by a new title in connection with these Messianic revelations, as "the Lord of Spirits," the Supreme Sovereign who establishes, by His spiritual hosts, order and righteousness in the various realms of creation.

The general conception.

The vividness of the prophecy is already foreshadowed by the form which it assumes. In one passage the Seer is represented as approaching the Divine presence, and contemplating the person of Messiah. "I saw," he says, "in heaven One, Ancient of days,[2] and His head was white as wool; and with Him was another, whose countenance was as the appearance of a man, and full of grace, like to one of the holy Angels. And I asked one of the Angels, who went with me and showed me all hidden things, of that Son of Man, who He was, and whence He was, and wherefore He went with the Ancient of days? And he answered me and spake to me: This is the Son of Man, to whom righteousness belongeth, with whom righteousness dwelleth (hath dwelt, L.), and who revealeth all the treasures of that

1 In giving a general view of the Messianic descriptions of Henoch, I have quoted the book in its final shape, not only because it is most convenient to do so, but because the book was current in this form at the Christian era, for the arguments of Hoffmann (*Schriftb.* i. 371) in favor of a later origin are quite unsatisfactory. It will be seen that the great mass belongs to Ewald's "First Book." In the "Second Book" the righteousness of Messiah is His characteristic attribute, just as the people of God are described as "the righteous" more usually than "the elect."

2 Dillm., *ein Haupt der Tage, betagtes Haupt.* The allusion to Dan. vii. 13, justifies the translation.

which is concealed, because the Lord of Spirits hath chosen Him; whose lot before the Lord of Spirits hath surpassed all through His uprightness forever (in everlasting righteousness, L.). And this Son of Man whom thou hast seen shall raise the kings and the mighty men from their beds, and the powerful even from their thrones; and shall unloose the bands of the powerful [with which they bind God's people], and break in pieces the teeth of sinners. And He shall hurl the kings from their thrones and their kingdoms, because they magnify Him not, nor praise Him, nor acknowledge with thankfulness whence the kingdom is lent to them. . . . . And they shall be driven from the dwellings of the assembly of His Church, and of the faithful."[1] . . . .

Messiah's character and divine attributes.

The attributes of majesty and humanity, of dominion and righteousness, with which Messias is here clothed, continually reäppear throughout the Visions, and the manifestation of these in the deliverance of the faithful and the final retribution of the wicked, forms the general object of His work. Without adding any new element to the fulness of the old prophets, the writer of Henoch endeavors to combine into one grand image the scattered traits in which they had foretold the working of their great king; and if he only dwells on the resistless might and certain triumph which should attend His advent, he differs from later zealots in retaining the essential character of superhuman glory with which Daniel had portrayed Him. He appears in several places to recognize the preëxistence of Messiah, while, at the same time, he describes Him as very man; and, though the interpretation of these passages has been questioned,[2] the clearness with which the eternal predestination of Messiah, and the intimate relation in which He stands at once to God and to the whole world of spirits, is one of the most conspicuous points in the teaching of the book.

1 c. xlvi. 2 Wrongly, I believe. Cf. Laurence, *Prel. Diss.* li. f.

"Before the sun and the signs of heaven were created, before the stars were made, the name [of the Son of Man] was named (invoked, L.) before the Lord of Spirits."[1] "He was chosen and hidden in the sight of God before the world was created, and He shall be to eternity in His sight."[2] At the day of His appearance, "the kings and mighty men and dwellers on the earth shall laud and praise and magnify Him who ruleth over all, who was hidden. For aforetime He, the Son of Man, was hidden, whom the Most High kept in the presence of His power, and revealed to the elect."[3] And thus it is said that Henoch, in his life time, was "translated from among the dwellers on the earth to that Son of Man, to the Lord of Spirits."[4] Even before His manifestation, the Messias was the joy of men and angels; for "the Wisdom of the Lord of Spirits revealed Him to the Holy and the Righteous ... for in His name are they delivered, and He is the avenger of their life."[5] And Henoch heard "the voice of the Angel Rufael praise the Elect One and the elect people" before the throne of the majesty of God.[6] The very stars and elements and powers of nature "rejoiced greatly, praising and magnifying [God], because that to them was revealed the name of that Son of Man."[7]

1 Compare the Rabbinical saying, that "the name of Messiah existed before the foundation of the world."

2 Cap. xlviii. 3, 6. "The elect and the concealed one existed in His presence before the world was created and forever." (Laur.)

3 Cap. lxii. 6, 7; c. lxi. 10, Laur.

4 Cap. lxx. 1. This difficult passage, which is the clearest testimony to the preëxistence of Messiah, belongs, according to Dillmann, to the "Noachian" additions to the original book, and so dates from the first century B. C. (Dillm. pp. xl. l.). Laurence's translation is quite different: "After this the name of the Son of Man, living with the Lord of Spirits, was exalted by the inhabitants of the earth." Cf. Dillm. l. c. Ewald (p. 124 n) gives another translation: "Afterwards was Henoch celebrated among men as living with Messias, and with God." . . . .

5 Cap. xlviii. 7. "He revealed the wisdom." . . . . — Laur.

6 Cap. xl. 5, 9.

7 Cap. lxix. 26 (lviii. 38, Laur.) From this passage it appears natural to conclude that the unutterable name — "the oath" — by which the whole world was ruled (c. lxix. 14 ff.) was the name of Messiah. Cf. Apoc. ii. 17. According to the present text, the title "Lord of Spirits" is once applied to Messiah, c. lxii. 2, but there is probably some corruption.

His humanity.

In contrast with this Divine aspect of Messiah are the many titles which declare His humanity and essential subordination to God. He is "the Righteous One,"[1] chosen by God for his uprightness; "the Elect One"[2] "according to God's good pleasure;" "the Anointed,"[3] "the Son of Man," "the Son of woman,"[4] while still also "the Son of God."[5] And though these titles belong in a peculiar sense to Messiah, as the type and head of His Church, they are extended also to all believers, who are called "the righteous," "the elect," "the children of God." Even the form under which Messiah was first described is applied in a lower scale to Henoch, who is addressed by an angel as "the Son of Man who is born to righteousness, and on whom righteousness dwelleth, and whom the righteousness of the Ancient of days leaves not."[6] In the imagery of one of the Visions, Messias is "born as a white bullock,"[7] and all the beasts of the field, and all the birds of the air, feared Him, and prayed to Him always. "And I looked," the Seer continues, "till all their races were changed, and they all became white bullocks." . . . And when the judgment is accomplished, it is said: "The whole host of heaven and all the Saints who are above, and the host of God, the Cherubim and Seraphim and Ophanim, and all the angels of might, and all the angels of dominion, and *the Elect One*, and the other powers which are on the land above the water, shall cry on that day, and with one voice exalt and praise and laud and magnify [God] in the spirit of faith, in the spirit of wisdom and of patience, and in the spirit of mercy, and in the spirit of right and of peace, and in the spirit of

1 Capp. xxxviii. 2; liii. 6.

2 Cap. xlv. 3, 4, etc. This is the most usual title of Messiah.

3 Capp. xlviii. 10; lii. 4 (only).

4 Cap. lxii. 5 (only). The form of the title appears to be suggested by the context. There is, I believe, no reference to Gen. iii. 15.

5 Cap. cv. 2 (only).

6 Cap. lxxi. 14 (lxx. 17, Laur.). Cf. c. lx. 10.

7 (lxxxix. 45, Laur.). By this figure He is likened to the Patriarchs. Cf. Dillm. p. 286.

goodness, and shall all say with one voice, Praise be to Him, and praised be the name of the Lord of Spirits, forever and ever." [1]

His excellent gifts.

But while Messiah is thus represented as man, and, perhaps, classed among created things, He stands far above all in the greatness of His gifts. Not only is He placed by God on the throne of His majesty to execute judgment in the world, but "wisdom is poured out like water, and there is no end of His majesty. He is mighty in all the secrets of righteousness, and unrighteousness passes away before Him like a shadow. . . . In Him dwells the spirit of wisdom, and the spirit of Him who giveth knowledge (the spirit of intellectual wisdom, L.), and the spirit of teaching and power, and *the spirit of those who have fallen asleep in righteousness.* And He shall judge the hidden things; and no man shall be able to utter an idle speech before Him, for He is chosen before the face of the Lord of Spirits according to His good pleasure." [2]

The effect of His coming.

The effect of the manifestation of Messias follows immediately from His character. "In those days shall a change be wrought for the holy and the elect; the light of day shall dwell upon them, and majesty and honor shall turn to them. And on the day of distress ruin shall be heaped upon sinners. . . . . And in those days the earth shall give back that which has been entrusted to it, and the kingdom of death shall give back that which has been entrusted to it, and Hell (Scheol) shall give back that which it owes. And [Messias] shall choose the righteous and holy among them, for the day is come that they should be delivered." [3]

1 Cap. lxi. 10, 11. From the position in which the words "the Elect" occur, and from a comparison of the context, a question may perhaps arise whether the reading is correct. Laurence's translation is not very probable: "And all the angels of the Lord, namely of the Elect one, and of the other Power, who was upon earth over the water on that day" (lx. 13); yet he defends it as containing "an obvious reference to Gen. i. 1," and "the declaration of a . . . . precise and distinct Trinity of Persons under the supreme appellation of *God and Lord.*" *Prel. Diss.* p. lii.

2 Cap. xlix. (c. xlviii. Laur.)

3 Capp. l. li. The doctrine of the resurrection is again described with

The wars which precede it; and

But the final establishment of Messiah's kingdom[1] is preceded by a time of devastation and conquest on earth — a "period of the sword." "I saw, and a great sword was given to the sheep — the long oppressed people of God; then the sheep went forth against the beasts of the field, — their ancient oppressors, — and all the beasts and the fowls of heaven fled before their face,"[2] and turned too late to prayer and repentance.[3] This occupies the eighth of the ten "weeks" into which the history of the world is divided; "and the sword is given that judgment and righteousness might be executed on them who act with violence, and the sinners given over into the hands of the righteous."[4] "And the hearts of the saints were full of joy that the number of righteousness was fulfilled, and the prayer of the righteous

singular force and detail, c. lxi. 5, 6. One point is particularly deserving of notice: in speaking of the future state of the wicked, the writer always speaks of their *spirits* only (Dillm. p. 165). The reünion with the body — the condition of sharing Messiah's kingdom — is reserved for the righteous. Cf. Hom. *Odyss.* xi. 487 ff.; Plato, *Resp.* 386 c. The same doctrine occupies a prominent place in the Mormonite system. Spencer's *Letters*, pp. 154 ff.

1 The mutual relation of the different parts of the "end of the world" is naturally obscure, and the obscurity is increased by much confusion both in the language and in the text of the book. The general interpretation which I have given appears to be intelligible and consistent; but two difficulties remain, as to the times of the appearance of Messiah, and of the great judgment. In c. xc. 37, the birth of "the white bullock, with great horns" (Messiah) is described as taking place after the period of the sword, and before the great conversion of the world (§ 38), though all men were already collected at the Holy City (*i. e.*, in the ninth week), and this, I believe, is the opinion of the writer. And, correspondingly, it appears to be his intention to place the great judgment at the end of the tenth week, after the peaceful reign over the converted world, though in c. xc. 20—27 it is described immediately after the period of the sword, probably as being its final consummation and spiritual antitype (cf. xlvii. 4; xlviii. 2). The character of Messiah as the resistless and righteous Judge requires that all judgments, even the period of the sword (c. xlviii. 4 ff.), should ultimately be referred to Him. The clearer statements must interpret the more general.

2 Cap. xc. 19 (lxxxix. 27, Laur.). But even the most terrible calamities are regarded as a judgment on sinners (and not a trial for the elect, cf. cap. c. 1 ff.).

3 Capp. lxiii. xxxviii. 6.

4 Cap. xci. 12 (xcii. 13, 14, Laur.), cf. c. xxxviii. 5. Even in this chapter the different stages of the great end of all things seem to be distinguished: "the period of the sword," § 4—6; "the revelation of the secrets of the righteous," § 3; "the manifestation of Messiah," § 2. See, also, c. xcviii. 12; xcvi. 1.

heard, and the blood of the righteous required before the Lord of Spirits."[1] At the end of this week the people of God have reared houses for themselves "in their own pleasant land," and built "a new temple for the great King," "greater and nobler than the first," and "all the sheep are therein." "And in that place I saw a fountain of righteousness which was inexhaustible; many fountains of wisdom encircled it, and all that were thirsty drank thereof, and were full of wisdom, and had their dwelling with the holy and righteous and elect."[2] In the ninth week "the righteous judgment is rendered, ... and all men look to the way of uprightness;" "and all the beasts of the field and all the fowls of heaven gathered themselves to the house [of God], and the Lord of the sheep had great joy that they were all good and returned to His house. And I looked till the sheep laid down the sword that was given to them, and brought it back to His house, and it was sealed before the face of the Lord. . . . And the eyes of all were opened that they should see that which is good (the good one, L.), and there was not one among them who saw not."[3] And after this, at the end of the tenth week, shall be the eternal judgment over the angels. . . . . "And the former heaven shall vanish and pass away, and a new heaven shall appear, and all the powers of heaven shall give light forever sevenfold. And after that shall be many weeks without number in goodness and righteousness, and sin shall be no more named forever and ever."[4] "And it shall come to pass in these days that the elect and holy children [of God, the Angels] shall descend from the heights of heaven, and join their Lord with the children of men."[5] "And from henceforth there will be nothing that corrupts (transitory, Dillm.) any more, for He, the Son of Man, has appeared, and sits upon the throne of His majesty, and all evil shall

its final blessedness.

1 Cap. xlvii. 4.
2 Cap. xlviii. 1.
3 Cap. xc. 33 f.
4 Cap. xci. 17 (xcii. 16, Laur.). Cf. c. xcii. 4, 5.
5 Cap. xxxix. 1. Cf. Dillm. l. c.

vanish and pass away before His face."[1] . . . "And the chosen One shall dwell among His chosen people."[2] "And they shall be arrayed in the robe of life; . . . and the Lord of Spirits shall dwell over them, and they shall dwell with that Son of Man, and eat with Him, and lie down and rise up forever and ever.[3]"[4]

Apoc. iii. 20.

(c) *The* Fourth *(second)* Book of Esdras.

The interval between the dates of the Books of Henoch and Esdras[5] was one of humiliation and trial for the faithful Jew. The kingdoms of the world grew stronger, and he was gradually brought again under their dominion. The very forms in which the revelations are clothed furnish apt symbols of the times in which they were respectively written, and of

1 Cap. lxix. 29.

2 Cap. xlv. 4.

3 Cap. lxii. 16, 14.

4 The traces of "mysticism" in the Book of Enoch are very rare; but they tend to show that the personification of *Wisdom* and *the Word* was entirely unconnected with the doctrine of Messiah. "Wisdom found no place where she should dwell; then had she a dwelling in heaven. Wisdom came to dwell among the children of men, and found no dwelling-place; then Wisdom returned to her place, and took up her abode among the angels. And unrighteousness (Folly) came forth from her abode [the indefiniteness of the phrase is worthy of notice]: she found those whom she sought not and dwelt among them, [welcomed] as the rain in the wilderness, and as the dew on the thirsty land" (c. xlii). In another place it is said: "The Righteous One [Messiah] shall arise from sleep, and Wisdom shall arise and be given to them [the elect]" (c. xci. 10). Once more: "The wisdom of the Lord of Spirits revealed [the Son of Man] to the holy and the righteous" (c. xlviii. 7). Again, Henoch is described as bidding his son collect all his household together, "for," he says, "the Word calls me, and the Spirit is poured out upon me." . . . . (xci. 1). So, again, c. xiv. 24: "The Lord called me and spake to me; Come hither, Henoch, and to my Holy Word." The passage xc. 38 (lxxxix. 47, Laur.) is, I believe, in spite of Ewald's authority (p. 159 n.), an interpolation; and Dillmann's explanation is at least very ingenious. The literal rendering as it stands is: "the first in the midst of them became [a word, and that word became] a large beast." Nor can I think that c. lii. 1, "When he brings His Word upon you shall ye not be destroyed," refers to Messiah personally. Cf. Dillm. ll. cc.

5 Lücke, *Einleitung, u. s. w.* § 12. Hilgenfeld, *Jud. Apok.* 187 ff. The best edition is that of Gfrörer, *Prophetæ veteres Pseudepigraphi*, Stuttgard, 1840, pp. 66 ff., who gives Laurence's Latin version of the Ethiopic (Oxon. 1820) with a collation of the old Latin, and the Arabic version (by Ockley in Whiston's *Primitive Christianity*, vol. iv., 1711). The *Dissertatio Critica* of Van der Vlis (Amsterd., 1839) I have not been able to use. The quotations are given according to the divisions in the English version; the references in brackets are to Gfrörer's divisions. The Ethiopic text is followed, unless the contrary is stated. The English version follows the Latin.

the general feelings by which they are pervaded. A patriarch translated from earth to heaven, and admitted to gaze face to face on the hosts of the spiritual world, is the fitting herald of wisdom, righteousness, and judgment to a people who, even in suffering, see in their tyrants only the objects of coming vengeance. A prince in exile with an exiled nation, the witness of heathen wickedness and the victim of tormenting doubts, pleads with significant energy the cause of a people whom their God seems to have forsaken and given up to the oppression of an alien.[1] The mysteries of the physical creation are as nothing to one who is bewildered by "the counsels of the Most High," though he is referred back to the lessons of nature that he may acknowledge his weakness.[2]

Distinguished from Henoch by

This fundamental difference of tone between the two Apocalypses appears to explain their divergences in detail. The burden of Esdras is throughout, "How long, O Lord?"[3] The present world is utterly corrupt; a few only shall share in the promised redemption. Fasting and tears are the preparation for his visions; and the seer no longer looks upon the mysteries of heaven, but listens to them as they are revealed by the ministry of angels.[4] Everywhere the language is that of an exile among the foul corruptions of Egypt, to whom the promised land is no longer the gathering field of nations, "the joy of the whole earth." The "woes of Messiah" are described with a terrible fulness, which is hardly exceeded by the despairing traditions of the Talmud.[5] "Behold, the days shall come that . . . . . the way of truth shall be hidden, and the land of faith shall be barren (*sterilis a fide* V. L.). But iniquity shall be increased, ... and the land shall be wasted utterly. . . . . The sun shall shine suddenly in the

(1) *Its gloomy tone; and*

1 Cf. c. vi. 9 (iv. 15). Esau appears to represent the Idumæan Herod. Hilgenf. p. 195.

2 iv. 5 ff. (ii. 7 ff.)

3 Cf. iv. 35 (ii. 44), etc.

4 Cf. iv. 21 (ii. 30).

5 Cf. pp. 127, 8.

night and the moon in the day, and blood shall drop from wood, and the stone shall give his voice and the people shall be troubled. . . . . There shall be a sound (*Chaos* V. L.) also in many places; . . . . . and friends shall destroy one another. Then shall wit hide itself, and understanding withdraw into his secret chamber, and shall be sought of many and yet not be found. Then shall unrighteousness and incontinency be multiplied upon earth. One land shall ask another and say, Is righteousness gone through thee, or one doing righteousness (*justum faciens* V. L.)? And it shall say, No. At that time shall men hope, and obtain nothing; they shall marry, and not rejoice; they shall labor, but their ways shall not prosper."[1] And these woes and evils are supposed to follow by an inevitable law from the working of nature. "For the world hath lost his youth, and the times begin to wax old. For the world is divided into twelve parts, and the ten parts of it are gone already and half of a tenth part. . . . . And look how much the world shall be weaker through age, so much the more shall evils increase upon them that dwell therein."[2] . . . . . "For the grain of evil was sown in the heart of Adam from the beginning, and the fruit of ungodliness hath been brought forth and multiplied up to this time, and shall yet be brought forth until the time of harvest come."[3] So "when commotion shall be seen in the world between several nations, and nations shall be disturbed, and the people shall be polluted, and princes shall hasten to mutual slaughter, and leaders shall be struck with consternation, then understand that of these the Most High hath spoken as coming before his appointed time."[4]

(2) *Its stern exclusiveness.*

The stern spirit of exclusiveness through which the blessings ushered in by these terrible signs are reserved for the Jewish nation alone, is another sign of the overwhelming sorrows

1 Ch. v. (iii.).
2 xiv. 10 ff. (xiv. 8 ff.). Cf. v. 54, 55; iv. 50.
3 iv. 30 (ii. 38).
4 ix. 3 ff. (ix. 2 ff.).

under which the writer of the book was bowed down. "And now, O Lord, ... if the world (ὁ αἰών) be made for our sakes,[1] why do we not possess an inheritance with the world? how long shall this endure?"[2] And when he inquires as to the end of all things and the terrible issues of Adam's sin, the answer is given: "The Most High hath made this world for many, but the world to come for few." . . . . . "There be many created, but few shall be saved."[3] "For you is Paradise opened, the tree of life is planted, the time to come is prepared: . . . . . and, therefore, ask no more questions concerning the multitude of them that perish;"[4] nay, rather "inquire how the righteous shall be saved, whose the world is and for whom the world is created."[5]

The coming of Messiah.

At length, when deceit and oppression and terror have filled the world, Messiah shall come, "even He whom (*Unctus* V. L.) the Highest hath kept for the end of days of the seed of David," (*Om.* V. L.), like "a lion from a wood," "rebuking the eagle for her unrighteousness and utterly consuming her." "The rest of my people shall He (*I* Æth.) deliver with mercy, them that have been preserved in my judgment," and "He shall make them joyful until the coming of the day of judgment, whereof I have spoken unto thee from the beginning."[6] Under another image Messiah is described as a man rising from the mysterious sea, into whose depth none can look;[7] for "no man upon earth can see my son [saith the Lord], or those that be with Him, but in the day [of His appearing]." "And afterwards,[8] that man flew

1 Cf. vi. 55 (iv. 63): "All this have I spoken before thee, O Lord, because thou madest the world for our sakes;" and vii. 10, 11 (v. 10).

2 vi. 57—59.

3 The entrance to the fair city was made "one only path, even between fire and water, so small that there could but one man go there at once" at the time of Adam's transgression, while before it was wide and sure, c. vii. 1—13.

4 viii. 1, 3, 52—55.

5 ix. 13. The scarceness of the good is given as a reason for God's delight in them (vi. 35, Æth.).

6 Cc. xi. 37 ff. (xi. 41 ff.); xii. 3, 31—34 (xii. 36 ff.).

7 c. xiii. 51, 52.

8 c. xiii. 1—13. *Convalescebat cum millibus cœli.* V. L.

with the clouds of heaven, and wheresoever He turned His countenance and looked, all things forthwith vanished before him; . . . . . and there was gathered together a multitude of men out of number, from the four winds of the heaven, to subdue the Man that came out of the sea. But I beheld, and lo, He had raised for Himself a great mountain and flew up upon it. . . . . And as the multitude came against Him, He neither lifted up His hand, nor took his sword, nor any instrument of war, but only there went forth out of his mouth a billow of fire . . . . . and burned them up every one, until nothing was left of them, but only the dust of their ashes and the smoke of their conflagration. . . . . Afterwards I saw the same Man come down from the mountain and call unto Him a peaceable multitude; and there came much people unto Him. Then was I struck with great fear, and I awaked. . . . . And this is the meaning of the vision:[1] The man whom thou sawest coming up from the heart of the sea, the same is He whom God the Highest hath kept a great season, to redeem the world unto Himself (*qui per semet ipsum liberabit creaturam suam* V. L.) . . . . . And the Most High shall begin to deliver those that dwell on the earth. [And He shall come to their astonishment (V. L.).] And one shall undertake to fight against another, one city against another, one place against another, one people against another, and one realm against another. And when these things shall come to pass, and the signs shall happen which I have showed thee before, then shall that Man (*filius meus* V. L. et Ar.) be declared, whom thou sawest (*ut virum* V. L.) ascending. And when all the people hear His voice they shall leave the battles they have in their own land one against another. And an innumerable multitude shall be gathered together desiring to slay Him. But He shall stand upon the top of Mount Sion. And Sion shall come, and shall be showed to all men, prepared and built, like

Apoc. xxi. 10.

1 c. xiii. 25—47.

as thou sawest that mountain to come forth and be formed without hands. And this is my Son, who shall rebuke the nations for their sins, ... and He shall destroy them without labor like coals of fire (*per ignem quæ igni assimilata est* V. L.). And whereas thou sawest that another peaceable multitude was gathered unto Him; these are the nine (*decem* V. L.; *novem et dimidia* Ar.[1]) tribes which were carried away prisoners out of their own land. . . . . But they took this counsel among themselves, that they would leave the stock of their people (*multitudinem gentium* V. L.) and go forth into a country where never mankind dwelt, that they might keep their statutes which they had never kept in their own land. And they entered through the narrow passages of the Euphrates. . . . . For the Most High held still the flood till they were passed over; . . . . . and now the Highest shall stay the springs of the stream again that they may go through;[2] therefore sawest thou the multitude come together." . . . . .

The reign thus commenced in terrible and overwhelming desolation shall last for four hundred years.[3]

The reign of Messiah.

"After these years," it is said, "shall my son Christ die, and all men that have breath. And the world shall be turned into the old silence seven days, like as in the first beginning, and no man shall remain. And after seven days [the world that yet awaketh not, V. L.] shall be raised up; and the corruptible world shall retire afar. And the earth shall restore those that are asleep in her, and so shall the dust those that are in silence, and the secret places shall deliver those souls that were committed unto them. And the Most High shall appear upon the seat of judgment; and His mercy shall come (*i. e.*, to the distressed faithful. *Pertransibunt miseriæ*,

1 Cf. Baruch, *Ep. Syr.* init.

2 Cf. Apoc. xvi. 12.

3 c. vii. 28—35. The clause is wanting in Æth. v. 29. Revelabitur enim Messias meus cum his qui cum eo [sunt], et lætificabit eos qui resuscitabuntur. *Filius meus Jesus* V. L. *Filius meus Messias* Ar.

V. L.), and His clemency shall cease, and his long-suffering shall have an end, but judgment only shall remain, and truth shall stand, and faith shall bud, and the work shall follow, and the reward shall be showed, and justice shall watch, and injustice shall not slumber." For "the day of doom shall be the end of this time and the beginning of immortality for to come, wherein corruption is past."[1] ....

Compared with the apostolic teaching.

The great outlines of these apocalyptic visions offer a striking parallel to the teaching of the apostles. The times of war and tumult which portend the coming of Messiah, His sudden appearance with a heavenly host, the destruction of the wicked by the breath of His mouth, the reign of triumph, the general resurrection and last judgment, are brought out with distinct clearness. Nor is this all; in spite of the importance attached to the "good works laid up in heaven," faith is required as a condition of salvation, Legalism is spiritualized by the recognition of a higher energy. But a sorrowful gloom is over all. Messiah Himself dies. Chaos resumes its old sway. The earth is not quickened with a new life, but passes away in a second creation.

The exclusiveness of Esdras carried to its furthest development in (d) The Book of Jubilees.

Errors such as these were the natural result of times of oppression; and we may believe that the author of the Book of Ezra would have welcomed Christianity as glad tidings; and that even if he had asked, with others, *Are there a few that be saved?* he would probably have acquiesced in the answer. But there was a yet narrower and sterner form of Jewish hope in which exclusiveness degenerated into the wildest intolerance, and the observance of the Law into the most passionate formalism. This spirit was evoked in its full energy by the rise of Christianity, and distinctly animates the *Book of Jubilees*,[2]

1 vii. 43 (vii. 12).

2 Translated by A. Dillmann in Ewald's *Jahrbücher der Biblischen Wissenschaft*, 1849, pp. 230 ff.; 1850, 1 ff. The book is mentioned under this title by Epiphanius *adv. Hær.* xxxix. § 6. ἐν τοῖς Ἰωβηλαίοις εὑρίσκεται, τῇ καὶ Λεπτογενέσει καλουμένῃ .... It is

which is one of the strangest relics of early Jewish literature. This remarkable narrative may be called a "hagadical" commentary on Genesis, and it derives its name from the fact that its entire arrangement is based on the festal cycle of forty-nine years. The object of the writer is to methodize the chronology of primeval history, to explain its difficulties, to enforce its lessons. In connection with the Apostolic writings, the chief importance of the book lies in the fierce severity with which it inculcates the ritual of the Law, and in the haughty pride with which it limits the special privileges of Israel. The Sabbath appears as no earthly institution, but as ordained first for angels, and observed in heaven before the creation of man.[1] The very object for which the people of Israel was chosen was that they might keep it. The eating of blood is an offence on the same level as the shedding of blood.[2] The cruel deed of Simeon and Levi is blessed;[3] and precedence over all men is given to Levi and his seed, and that they should "be as the Angels of the presence." It is taught that the Mosaic ordinances were not only observed by the patriarchs, but written in heavenly tables and binding forever.[4] And nothing less than the successful claims of Christianity to have fulfilled and spiritualized the precepts of the Law, can explain the stress which is laid upon its permanent force, and the hopeless penalties which are attached to the neglect of it. In the presence of ritualism such as this the vision of Messiah almost fades away. The personal char-

also called ἡ τοῦ Μωΰσεως ἀποκάλυψις, μικρογένεσις, τὰ λεπτὰ Γενέσεως (Dillmann, pp. 74, 76). Its date is some time in the first century (id. p. 88), later than the Book of Henoch (id. p. 90) and earlier than the Testaments of the twelve Patriarchs (id. p. 91). The Æthiopic version was made from a Greek text: whether this was the original text is uncertain from internal evidence, and Jerome evidently alludes to a Hebrew original of the book. *Ep.* lxxviii. 18, 24. Cf. Ed. Bened. l. c.; Dillm. pp. 88 ff.

1 c. ii. pp. 235-6. Cf. c. 50.

2 Pp. 245, 248.

3 Pp. 37—39.

4 Pp. 245, 12 (the feast of Tabernacles celebrated by Abraham), 6 (Tithes), 9 (Circumcision), 49 (Passover). In the face of this stern ritualism it is strange that a tradition should exist which derives Gal. vi. 15 from the ἀποκάλυψις Μωΰσεως. Cf. Meyer, l. c.

acter of the Redeemer is lost in the vague anticipation of a general return from the dispersion.[1] The transition from "this world" to "the world to come" is found in a gradual progress of moral and physical evil, "till the children are gray-headed," followed by a period of deepening repentance and increasing strength, which culminates in an age when men shall enjoy a thousand years of perpetual youth, and no Satan or destroyer disturb their happiness.[2, 3]

2. The doctrine of Messiah in the exegetic literature.

At the same time that the attempt was made to furnish a supplement to Scripture in the Apocalyptic writings, the books of Scripture themselves were submitted to a formal interpretation. Egypt and Palestine shared alike in the work of translation, as they joined in completing the image of Messiah's triumph; and the Septuagint and the Targums remain as the monuments of their labors. Regarding only their present form, the LXX. is the most ancient version; and it is perhaps characteristic of the time and place at which it was made[4] that it contains scarcely any passages which bring forward the person of Messiah in a clearer light than the original text.[5] In some places the original ambiguity between a race and a person is decided by the selection of the race as the source of the Divine blessings; in others the future hope appears to be lost in the present which served as the type of it; in others the fulness of the original prediction is lowered and compressed; but generally the words of the

(a) The Septuagint.

1 No mention is made of the promise to Eve, p. 238.

2 Cc. i. cxxiii.; pp. 222, 23, 24.

3 The *Ascensio Esaiæ* (Gfrörer, *Prophetæ veteres Pseudepigraphi*, pp. 1 ff.), though a Christian Apocalypse, contains some peculiar elements of Jewish tradition. The description of the successive descents of Messiah through the seven heavens preparatory to His incarnation is well worthy of notice, c. iii. 13—21. Cf. Clem. *Hom.* iii. 20. Nero is directly identified with Antichrist, c. iv. 1.

4 Cf. p. 96.

5 Of these the most remarkable is Numb. xxiv. 7 (quoted by Philo, ii. p. 423 M.). Isai. xxxviii. 11 is very questionable; and even in the first passage there is no distinct reference to Messiah. Compare also Amos ix. 12 (Acts xv. 17).

original are reproduced without any attempt to apply or elucidate them.[1]

(b) *The* Targums.

But the case is far different with the Targums; and next to the writings of the New Testament the Targums of Onkelos[2] and Jonathan furnish the best contemporary evidence as to the nature of the received view of the Messiah at the commencement of the Christian era. This testimony, however, is not only an authentic expression of the current belief, but rather an embodiment of traditional teaching. The introduction of oral Chaldaic paraphrases in the public reading of the Scriptures dates from the time of Ezra; and there is every reason to believe that written translations existed as early as the first century before Christ, though for a long time interpreters would naturally shrink from committing their versions to writing. Passing by the scanty notices of these first versions, the paraphrase of the Law by Onkelos, and that of the Prophets by Jonathan ben Usiel, are at once the oldest and the most important. Both appear to belong to the first half of the first century, though the evidence by which their date is determined is scanty and incomplete.[3] The first, as was required by the nature of the subject, is strictly accurate and clear, rarely departing from the original text except to avoid the semblance of anthropomorphic doctrine. In the latter, wider scope was offered to the translator, as well through the greater freedom allowed in the treatment of the prophetic books, as by the necessity

1 Cf. Gen. iii. 15, *αὐτός σου τηρήσει κ.* LXX. (cf. Philo i. p. 124), *συντρίψει* Rom. xvi. 20; but probably *τηρ.* is an old mistake for *τειρήσει.* Gen. xlix. 8—10, *τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ* LXX. *ᾧ ἀποκεῖται*, s. *οὗ ἐστίν all.* (cf. Just. *Dial. c. Tryph.* § 120; Credner, *Beitr.* ii. 51 ff.) Num. xxiv. 17—19; LXX. = *ἡγούμενος* v. 19. (Cf. Credner, a. a. o. 64). Isai. iv. 2, lost in LXX. Isai. ix. 6, *τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. Μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος* LXX.). Isai. xl. 1 ff. LXX. of Israel and not of Messiah; vv. 2, 3, in Matt. xii. 18—21 ✕ LXX. Isai. xlix. 1 ff. is ambiguous, apparently of Israel. Ps. ii. 6, *ἐγὼ δὲ κατεστάθην* LXX. Ps. cx. (cix.) 5, *συνέθλασεν* LXX. Hagg. ii. 7, *τὰ ἐκλεκτα* LXX.

2 I have not been able to make use of Luzzato's Rabbinical Essay on Onkelos: *Philoxenus*, etc. Viennæ, 1830.

3 The arguments of Gfrörer are, on the whole, sufficient to prove that they were made before the final overthrow of Jerusalem (*Jahrh. d. Heils*, i. 36—38).

of giving distinctness to the sublime predictions which they contained. It is probable that both have been interpolated in some degree by later hands; but the attempts to show that they have been modified with a polemical object against the Christians must be considered to have failed.[1]

i. The Targum of Onkelos.

The Targum of Onkelos, from its literal exactness, could not contain many explicit references to the Messiah. Two passages only are quoted in which he introduces the title, but those are of the utmost importance, as recognizing generally the period of Messiah's coming, and the majesty of His kingdom. In translating the well-known words of Jacob's blessing *till Shiloh come*, he says *till Messiah comes, whose is the kingdom, and to whom is the gathering of the nations.* And he gives a corresponding rendering of the prophecy of Balaam: *A king shall rise from Jacob, and a Messiah shall be anointed from Israel.* The last words are perhaps in themselves ambiguous, but when taken in connection with constant Jewish tradition their meaning cannot be doubtful.

Gen. xlix. 10.

Num. xxiv. 17.

1 Zunz, *Gottesd. Vorträge*, pp. 61 ff. The Messianic passages from the Targums are collected by Buxtorf, *Lex. Talmud.* p. 1268 ff., with some slight errors; and in a convenient form, with the Hebrew text and double English translation, by R. Young, *The Christology of the Targums*, Eding., 1853. In addition to the Targum of Onkelos on the Pentateuch, there is a second, originally known as the *Palestine Targum*, which exists at present in a double recension on the *Jerusalem Targum* and the *Targum of the Pseudo-Jonathan.* In its present form this probably dates from the second half of the seventh century (Zunz, 77), though based on older materials. Its character is rather that of *Interpretation* (Midrash) than of *Translation.* Fragments exist of a Jerusalem Targum on the Prophets (Zunz, 77 ff.) The Targums on the Hagiographa are perhaps later. That on the Psalms, Proverbs, and Job is assigned by Zunz to the same country (Syria) and date, without determining what this is: the Targum on the Psalms speaks of *Constantinople* (Zunz, p. 64 n.). The author of the Targum of the five *Migilloth* (Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Canticles) lived probably "*ziemlich lange nach der talmudischen Epoche*" (id. p. 65). No Targum of Ezra, Nehemiah, or Daniel exists. That on Chronicles is of very late date.

The account of the Targums by Zunz (ch. v.) is most masterly and exact, and contains in a brief space and a scholar-like form all, I believe, that is yet known certainly as to their history.

The Messianic interpretations of Jonathan are numerous and interesting, agreeing in most cases with the current of later teaching. Thus, he says, *A king shall come forth from the sons of Jesse, and Messiah shall arise from his sons' sons.* This is the *branch of the Lord, the son given to the house of David, who shall endure forever, in whose time shall be much peace;* yet He shall execute a terrible vengeance on the enemies of His people, *like a fiery flying serpent. By Him shall the nations be broken in pieces:* and they shall *bring offerings to Him, because He shall be established in goodness, and be seated on His throne in truth;* and *He shall be for a crown of joy.* At the same time the Messiah appears not only as a conquering and triumphant king, but also as *the servant* of the Lord, *the servant whom He had chosen*, who *should prosper.* And though Jonathan sees in the description of Christ's sufferings only the chastisement of the Jewish nation, yet he connects this period of distress with Messiah's coming. *Because God hath cleansed their souls from sins, they shall see the kingdom of their Messiah, they shall have many sons and daughters, they shall prolong their days, and keeping the Law of the Lord they shall be happy according to His good pleasure.*

ii. *The* Targum of Jonathan ben Usiel.

Is. xi. 1.

Is. iv. 2; cf. *Zech. iii.* 8.

Jer. xxiii. 5.

Jer. xxxiii. 15.

Is. ix. 6.

Is. xiv. 29.

Is. x. 27.

Is. xvi. 1, 5.

Is. xxviii. 5.

Is. xlii. 1. Cf. *Zech. iii.* 8.

Is. xliii. 10.

Is. lii. 13.

So also in the other prophets Messiah is that second David, the king of Israel, whom the Lord should raise up; who *should go forth from them, and be revealed from the midst of them, and teach them the worship of the Lord*, as the mystical shepherd to whom the flock should be restored, *in whom all the just should trust, and all the humble dwell under the shadow of His kingdom.* And as He was to be the son of David, and Himself the spiritual David, so was He to come forth from Bethlehem, David's city, being *named from the be-*

Hos. iii. 5.

Jer. xxx. 9; *xxxiii.* 13—15.

Ezek. xvii. 23. Cf. *Hos. xiv.* 7, (8).

Zech. vi. 13.

ginning, and destined to rule over all the kingdoms of the earth.[1]

iii. *The later Targums on the Pentateuch.*

The later Targums on the Pentateuch exhibit a striking contrast to the rigid simplicity of Onkelos, and in their Messianic passages show clearly the hopes and influence of a later age. In addition to the two passages which he applies to Messiah,[2] they explain fifteen others as referring to His time. *Moses came forth from the desert, Messiah*, it is said, *shall come out of Rome* [the Roman Empire?], in the great paschal night of the second deliverance of Israel. Then, *though the people be scattered to the uttermost parts of heaven, the Word of the Lord shall gather them thence by the hand of Elias the great priest, and bring them thence by the hand of Messiah the King.* The idea of the terrible conflict of good and evil "in the last days" had assumed a form and consistency not found in the earlier writings. Then shall *the serpent strive to sting men in the heel, but the sons of the woman shall secure their deliverance in "the heel of time," the days of Messiah. All the sons of the East*, in league with Amalek, whose sin *shall never be forgotten, shall then join battle with the house of Israel, and fall forever*, for *the cry of Messiah* is among His people. Already a second Messiah — the son of Ephraim — appears in contrast with Messiah the King, and they are compared respectively to the laver in the court of the tabernacle and the vessels in the tabernacle itself. But still Eder, a watch-tower near Bethlehem, is spoken of as the place *from which Messiah shall be revealed in the end of days.*[3]

Ex. xii. 42.

Deut. xxx. 4.

Gen. iii. 15.
Deut. xxv. 19.
Ex. xvii. 16.
Numb. xxiv. 20.
Numb. xxiii. 21.

Ex. xl. 9, 11.

Gen. xxxv. 21.

1 The references to 1 Sam. ii. 10, and 2 Sam. xxiii. 3, are at least uncertain; that to Isai. xlv. 1 obviously incorrect.

2 Both Targums extend the application of Gen. xlix. 11, 12 expressly to Messiah.

3 The same interpretation appears also in a passage contained in the Targum of Jonathan on Mic. iv. 8 (*And thou tower of Eder*), which, however, seems to be an interpolation: Et tu Messia Israelis, *qui occultaris propter*

The Targums on the Hagiographa contain but few distinct Messianic allusions. The only Psalms which are directly applied to the Messiah are Ps. xxi., xlv., lxi., lxxii. The six measures of barley which Ruth received from Boaz are interpreted to symbolize the *six righteous men who should spring from her. . . . . David, Daniel with his companions, and King Messias.* In the paraphrase of Lamentations, it is said: *Thou* [O Lord] *shalt proclaim freedom to thy people, the house of Israel, by the hand of Messiah, as thou didst by the hand of Moses and Aaron, in the time of the Passover;* and thou Zion *shalt be freed by the hand of Messiah, and of Elias the High Priest.* In Ecclesiastes it is expressly said that *the day of the coming of King Messiah is a mystery, as the day of death; and who is he who shall discover it by wisdom?* Several passages in Canticles are referred to the Messiah; and special mention is made of the *two deliverers who should arise, Messias the son of David, and Messias the son of Ephraim.*

iv. *The Targum on the Hagiographa.*

Ruth iii. 15.

Lam. ii. 22.

Lam. iv. 22.

Eccles. vii. 25. Cf. *i.* 11.

Cant. iv. 5.

But while the Apocalyptic and Interpretative literature of the Jews shows the form which the Messianic hope had assumed as a theological dogma at the beginning of the Christian era, it conveys little information as to the hold which the doctrine retained on the mass of the people. The teaching of the schools could scarcely touch the sympathies or influence the character of "the multitude who knew not the law;" and the literature which survives in after generations is generally that which was in advance of the age in which it appeared.

This literary testimony does not reach to the popular belief.

John vii. 49.

One important fragment, however, of what may be called the popular literature has been preserved. The "Psalms of Solomon"[1] appear to belong to the times of

peccata Ecclesiæ Zionis, ad te regnum venturum est.

1 The Greek translation, which alone remains, is given by Fabricius, *Cod.*

the Antiochean persecution,[1] and to express the deep penitence and the devout hope of a pious Jew at that crisis. They are distinguished from the Apocalyptic writings by a clearer recognition of the sins of the people, and from the books of the Apocrypha by a greater simplicity and a closer adherence to the language of the Old Testament. The view which they give of Messiah is proportionately distinct and full, especially in the exhibition of the spiritual character of His reign. After general prayers for mercy and restoration (vii., xi.), and beyond the anticipation of a divine visitation for judgment (xv.), the recollection of the promise "to David and his seed forever" rises in marked preëminence (xvii.). Though His throne be cast down, yet shall it be raised up. A king, it is said,[2] a Son of David, shall be girded with strength to bruise unjust rulers, to cleanse Jerusalem, to remove sinners, to gather together the just from all the places in which they have been scattered. He shall shake the earth with His word, the writer adds, and bless His people, and the Gentiles shall serve Him. He shall be "free from sin" (καθαρὸς ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας), "an anointed Lord" (χριστὸς κύριος[3]), and "shall not be weak" through the strength of God. And "happy are those who are born in His days, to see the blessings of Israel, which God shall bring to pass in the congregation of the tribes."[4]

v. *The* Psalms of Solomon.

II. *The Messianic hope of the Jews as described in the historic records of the first century.*

The language of these Psalms offers a near approximation to the tone of those who first welcomed the Messiah; but the various details gathered from a scanty literature are first combined

Pseudep. V. T. i. 914 ff. The Psalms are translated, and assigned to a second Solomon of the time of the Return, by Whiston, *Authentic Records*, etc., i. pp. 117 ff. Cf. Ewald, iv. 343 f.

1 Cf. Ewald, iv. 343 n. The language of Psalm viii. seems decisive on this point.

2 Psalm xvii. 5, 8, 23 ff.

3 Psalm xvii. 36. Ewald (iv. 344 n.) conjectures that this may be an error of translation for Χρ. κυρίου. Cf. Luc. ii. 11 (*varr. lectt.*), 26.

4 Psalms xvii. 50; xviii. 7.

into a living picture in the records of the New Testament. Without the historical narrative the sum of the theological teaching is confused and often unintelligible. But in a few scattered phrases the Apostolic writers have preserved a striking outline of the different forms which the national hope of the Jews assumed at the time and on the scene of Christ's appearance. The variety and distinctness of the traits which they have marked, their simplicity and naturalness, their vital connection with existing circumstances, and the confirmation which they receive from subsequent history, are alike worthy of careful study; and taken together they combine to give a vivid and life-like image of the popular creed as it was apprehended by men who were ready to die for it.

1. *The New Testament.*

The early literature of the Jews recognized the existence of very different ideas of the Messianic work. The difference which was thus admitted in theory was embodied in life. The faith and spirit of the believer in this case, as in every other, moulded the substance of his belief; and Holy Scripture seemed to promise to each in the coming deliverance exactly that freedom for which he longed most ardently. Atonement, independence, restoration, dominion, union — such were the manifold ideas included in the glorious prospect of Messiah's kingdom.

The variety *and*

But while the form of the hope was indefinite, its presence was universal. In some form or other general expectation was quickened in Judæa, and in Samaria, and among the Jews of the dispersion;[1] "Jerusalem and all Judæa, and all the region round about Jordan went out" to John's Baptism, without distinction of rank or sect, "musing whether he were Christ."[2] In the most different stations were those who "waited for the kingdom of God." "To this the

wide spread *of belief.*

1 John i. 41; iv. 25; Acts xxvi. 7.

2 Matt. iii. 5; Luke iii. 15; John i. 20; iii. 28. Yet here, as elsewhere, the common people seem to have heard him most gladly: Matt. xxi. 23—27; Mark xi. 27—33; Luke xx. 6.

twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hoped to come." And at a later time Simon the mystic and Barkokeba the zealot found multitudes ready to welcome in them either the "great power of God" or the "star which should rise out of Israel."

Acts xxvi. 7.

Even in the great diversity of opinion which existed as to Messiah, some points seem to have been settled by general tradition or consent. It was held that the time of His advent, though fixed in the Divine counsels, was unknown by men, who meanwhile were looking anxiously in "the distress of nations" for those "signs" which they had been taught to expect as the first announcement of "the fulness of the time." General belief pointed to an appearance startling and sudden, in the "wilderness" or in the "secret chamber." Even the Pharisees asked Christ "when the kingdom of God should come."[1] And here, too, special blessings were reserved for such as looked for them. In the capital of Herod there was one "just and devout, waiting for the consolation of Israel, to whom it was revealed that he should not see death till he had seen the Lord's Anointed." And others shared the hope and assurance of Simeon, since Anna could speak freely of Jesus "to those who were waiting for the redemption of Jerusalem."[2]

The Time *of Messiah's coming.*

Luke ii. 25, 26.

Luke ii. 38.

The uncertainty which attached to the time extended also to the manner of Messiah's appearance. The question of the Magi when they inquired for Him "who was *born* King of the Jews," showed a faith not general at the period. In recognizing a child as King their spiritual insight may be compared with that of Simeon and Anna. By others it was made an objection to the claims of our Lord, especially by His own countrymen, that His family was known

The Manner.

Matt. xiii. 54–58.

1 Luke xvii. 20.

2 All. c. ADLX., etc., ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ. All. τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, S. ἐν τῷ Ἰσ.

to them and dwelt among them. "*We know this man whence he is*," said the people of Jerusalem, "*but when Christ cometh no man knoweth whence He is.*" "How can this man, *whose father and mother we know*," asked the multitudes at Capernaum, say, "*I came down from heaven?*" They expected to hear the cry, "Lo, here is Christ, or lo there," and to see him declared at once in the fulness of power and strength as the deliverer of His people.

John vii. 27.

As the star in the East was to be the physical emblem of Christ's coming, so was it universally believed that Elijah would prepare His way at once, by restoring the ancient faith of the people, and by consecrating Him to His office. This belief was already part of the popular teaching, and even the disciples seemed to have looked for its literal accomplishment, when they suggested the difficulty: *How say the scribes that Elias must first come?* Nor was this all; as Elijah represented the majesty of the prophets, so Jeremiah symbolized their devotion; and he who had "prayed much for his people and the Holy City," was specially named among the company of Messiah at his appearance.[1]

The signs.

Matt. xvii. 10 ||.

2 Macc. xv. 14.

Such being among the acknowledged signs of the Messiah, it was determined with equal agreement that He should spring from Bethlehem, the city of David. The answer of the priests to Herod is confirmed by the doubts of those who at a later time questioned the Messiahship of one whom they supposed to be a Galilæan, for they asked, *Did not the Scripture say that Christ cometh of the seed of David, and from Bethlehem, whence David was?*

The Birthplace.

Matt. ii. 5.

John vii. 41, 42.

And not only was the Messiah to spring from David's city; He was emphatically David's son.[2]

The Davidic *type.*

1 Matt. xvi. 14. Cf. 4 Esdr. ii. 15 (Isaiah).

2 The title itself does not occur in the writings of St. John, and yet in the

Such was the answer which the Pharisees made to the question of our Lord; and when the multitudes were amazed at the miracles of Jesus they said, *Is not this the Son of David?* evidently understanding by the words the promised King. The blind on two occasions addressed Him by the same title, *Have mercy on us, thou Son of David.* And the name was spread abroad even among strangers: "*A woman of Canaan .... cried unto Him, saying, Have mercy on me, Lord, thou Son of David.*" So when the pilgrim multitude led Him in triumph, the song was still, "*Hosanna to the Son of David;*" "*blessed be the kingdom of our father David, which cometh in the name of the Lord;*"[1] and when the triumph was over the children in the temple once more caught up the words.

Matt. xxii. 42 ||.
Matt. xii. 23.
Matt. ix. 27.
Matt. xx. 30 ||.
Matt. xv. 22.
Matt. xxi. 9.
Matt. xxi. 15.

The type of royal power was naturally that on which the mass of the Jews dwelt with the liveliest hope, but the image and promise of Moses moulded the expectations of some among them. These looked for a prophet rather than for a king,[2] though they entertained no clear conception of the scope of his teaching; and the "likeness" of which Moses spoke, led them to anticipate an outward resemblance in life rather than in work between the lawgivers of the Old and New, which attained in later times a fabulous minuteness.[3] A trace of this tendency occurs in the Gospels: when the multitudes said, *This is of a truth that prophet which should come into the world,* they soon called to mind the manna in the wilderness, and

The Mosaic *type.*
Deut. xviii. 15.
John vi. 31 *ff.*

passage just quoted he implicitly recognizes it. Cf. Apoc. v. 5; xxii. 16, ἡ ῥίζα Δαυίδ. In the Epistles the Davidic descent of Christ is only twice alluded to: Rom. i. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 8.

1 Mark xi. 10. Cf. Luke i. 32, 69.

2 John vi. 14. Elsewhere "the Prophet" and "the Messiah" are distinguished: John i. 21; vii. 40. Cf. John i. 46. Perhaps the expressive title, "He that cometh" (Matt. xi. 3 ||), is to be referred to this source.

3 Cf. Gfrörer, ii. 333 ff. Infr. p. 150.

asked for a sign like this through which they might believe. But the Mosaic type of Messiah was first capable of a full realization on the foundation of a Christian Church, and consequently it appears prominently in the Acts of the Apostles.[1] Before that time the woman of Samaria, who might be supposed to feel most deeply the need of a second Moses, expressed most truly the belief in His advent.[2] In the later books of the New Testament the completeness of the mutual relation between Moses and Christ is perfected by the allusions to a spiritual Balaam; and in the imagery of the Apocalypse a second song of Moses celebrates the final triumph of the new Deliverer.[3]

The Divine character.

At the same time the higher side of Messiah's nature was not denied or forgotten. The temptation turned upon the assumption of the title of "Son of God;"[4] and during our Lord's ministry the evil spirits sought to precipitate and so to mar His work by proclaiming His divine character. The mystery, however, which was hidden from the eyes of the multitude, to whom it seemed blasphemy, was proclaimed or acknowledged at solemn crises. Thus John the Baptist, Nathanael, Peter, and Mary, bore witness to Christ as the Son of God; and the Sanhedrin recognized the title as belonging to Messiah when the High Priest, in the presence of the assembly, solemnly adjured Jesus, saying:

1 Acts iii. 19 ff.; vii. 37 ff.

2 John iv. 25. The Messianic doctrine of the Essenes probably assumed this form.

3 1 Pet. ii. 15; Jude 11.; Apoc. ii. 14 (ii. 15). There is no trace of this "Antichrist" in early Jewish writings. *Armillus* belongs to a much later period.

4 The following table gives, I think, a correct summary of the usage of Messiah's title, "Son of God" ([ὁ] *υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*), in the Gospels:

i. By our Lord Himself: John iii. 17, 18(?); v. 25; ix. 35 (?); x. 36; xi. 4.

ii. By believers: Matt. xvi. 16 (St. Peter not in ‖, but cf. John vi. 69); [Mark i. 1]; John i. 34, 50; xi. 27; [xx. 31].

iii. By Jews: Matt. xxvi. 63; xxvii. 40, 43; cf. John xix. 7 *νόμ. θ.*; Luke xxii. 70.

iv. By evil spirits: Matt. iv. 3, 6 ‖; viii. 29 ‖; Mark iii. 11; Luke iv. 41.

The sailors (Matt. xiv. 33) and the centurion (Matt. xxvii. 54; Mark xv. 39) see in Christ *υἱὸς θεοῦ*.

Matt. xxvi. 63.

Tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God.[1]

The fatal error of the Jewish people lay in the opposite direction; for in the fond anticipations of a second David, as some divine champion, they disregarded the true humanity of the Messiah. Looking for a sign from heaven, they could not read the signs on earth before them. The disciples "*were sorry*" when Christ spoke to them of His coming passion. St. Peter even *began to rebuke Him* for admitting that such humiliation was possible. Till His death, some had hoped that it had *been He who should have redeemed Israel*, but then their hope was lost, till Christ Himself showed them that the prophets had foretold all these things; and by the help of this divine teaching they set forth from that time the sufferings of Messiah from the Scriptures. Such being the feelings of those who were nearest to Christ, it cannot but be strange that the people were more perplexed by His lowliness.[2] When He spoke of Himself as the Son of man, the people answered: . . . . . *Who is this Son of Man?*[3] Even when they were most startled by His works or words of power, they generally saw in Him no more than a prophet, or waited for some more striking revelation of His majesty.[4] "*If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly*," was the complaint at one time; and at another, when they "*wondered at His gracious words*," "*they said, Is not this Joseph's son?*"

The true Human *character disregarded.*

Matt. xvii. 23.

Matt. xvi. 22.

Luke xxiv. 21.

Luke xxiv. 46.

Acts xvii. 3; xxvi. 23; viii. 32 *ff.*

A partial conception of Messiah's work necessarily fol-

1 The statements of Justin (*Dial.* § 49) and Celsus (*Orig. c. Cels.* ii. 29) cannot invalidate this evidence. The forms which the Messianic hope assumed among the Jews were various, and the prevalence of one form among a particular class, or at a time, cannot exclude the others.

2 Cf. pp. 122, 129.

3 John xii. 34. Cf. John ix. 35, varr. lectt.

4 Cf. Matt. xxi. 11, 46; Mark ii. 12; vii. 37; xi. 18; Luke iv. 32, 37; v. 26; vii. 16 [ix. 9; xxiii. 8]. See also John vii. 26, 31; viii. 53.

lowed from a partial conception of His nature. To the Jews this appeared to be bounded by the establishment of a glorious kingdom and the confirmation of their law. A second and spiritual birth of God's people or God's servants seemed alike impossible and unnatural; and Nicodemus, according to the spirit of his countrymen, might well find it difficult to understand how it should be required of him to lay aside the opinions and prejudices which had grown about him from his infancy, before he could even see that kingdom for which he sought. The brethren of Jesus, who saw His works, still wished for an open manifestation of His power and office, for they could not "believe" in a Messiah who hid Himself from the great world.[1] Peter was eager to pay for his Master the tribute to the Temple, after his inspired confession. The fiery zeal of the sons of Zebedee led them to seek places next to their Saviour's throne; and the Apostles inquired of the risen Lord whether he would "*at that time restore the kingdom to Israel.*" Some indeed seem to have looked further for "a restitution of the world;" but it was reserved for Samaritans, conscious of doubt and sin, to feel that Messiah[2] would "*announce all things*," — even the true forms of worship, — and be "*the Saviour of the world.*"[3]

The partial conception of Messiah's work.

John iii. 2—4.

Matt. xvii. 24 ff.
Matt. xx. 21.

Acts i. 6.

1 John iii. 2—4; vii. 3—5. In the latter passage it is evident that the brethren of the Lord sought only to precipitate the declaration of this Messiahship. They lacked that faith which could rest wholly in Him and abide His time. Cf. John ii. 23, 24.

2 The title *Messias* occurs only in John i. 42; iv. 25. Can it be without meaning that the Hebrew word is preserved exactly in these two places, where the simple faith in the ancient promise seems liveliest?

3 From the circumstances of our Lord's examination before the Sanhedrin, it is evident that He had not openly proclaimed Himself as the Messiah, or the adjuration of the High Priest had been unnecessary. In like manner it is clear that the abrogation of the Mosaic Law had not formed part of His public teaching. The formation of an outward Church necessarily preceded the announcement of this truth. It is also important to notice, that in early Jewish writings there is no trace of a belief in the substitution of a spiritual for a ritual law,

But while the poor and simple "guileless Israelites," rude Galilæans, fiery zealots, clung severally to some peculiar Messianic hope, those Jews who had been brought into closer connection with Greek literature or Roman dominion seem to have looked on the popular belief as exaggerated or groundless fanaticism. The "leaven of Herod" had penetrated the nation of God. Many thoughts were working, though as yet unrevealed, at the time when Simeon foresaw that the Saviour was set as well "for the fall" as "for the rising of many," and "*for a sign which should be spoken against.*" Hillel, "the second restorer of the Law," said that there would be no Messiah. According to him, the promise and its fulfilment belonged to the time of Hezekiah; and though, in fact, he may have rejected only the notion of a temporal kingdom, his opinion gained extensive currency in its literal sense.[1] Philo speaks only in one place of the coming of a deliverer. "A man shall come," says the oracle, "leading a host, and he shall subdue nations great and populous by the aid of God, who shall send the help that befits the holy. And this is an undaunted bravery of soul, and a most mighty strength of body,[2] two things of which even one is formidable, but if both meet they are wholly irresistible. But some of the foes [the oracle says] are unworthy to be defeated by men, against whom [God] will array swarms of wasps for their most shameful destruction, warring in

2. In contemporary writers.

The Messianic hope fainter among some classes.

Luke ii. 34 ff.

(a) PHILO.

The type of an "idealizing" party.

which assumed a definite form after the tenth century.

1 *Sanhedr.* c. 98. Cf. Just. M. *Dial.* 68, 71, 77. Thus at a later time the priests and zealots were ranged on opposite sides: Gfrörer, ii. p. 439.

2 Philo, *de Præm.* § 16 (page 423 M.), (Numb. xxiv. 7, LXX.). The reference to "an inspired prophet" (*de Monarch.* i. § 9) is too general to be applied certainly to Messiah, yet the passage claims attention: ἀλλά τις ἐπιφανεὶς ἐξαπίναιως προφήτης θεοφόρητος θεσπιεῖ καὶ προφητεύσει, λέγων μὲν οἰκεῖον οὐδὲν, οὐδὲ γὰρ, εἰ λέγει, δύναται καταλαβεῖν ὅ γε κατεχόμενος ὄντως καὶ ἐνθουσιῶν, ὅσα δὲ ἐνηχεῖται διελεύσεται, καθάπερ ὑποβάλλοντος ἑτέρου. No description, perhaps, could offer a more instructive contrast to the prophetic office of Christ.

defence of the holy ones. [It says] moreover, that this [hero] shall not only enjoy surely, without bloodshed, victory in war, but also an unassailable right of sovereignty, for the help of those who may become his subjects through good-will, or fear, or reverence." It is only necessary to read the context to feel how little importance Philo laid on the presence or work of this victorious deliverer. The hope which he cherished rested on the promises made to the whole nation, and not on the predictions of a single deliverer; and thus, while his expectation of a personal Messiah was apparently feeble, he paints in glowing colors the blessedness of a coming reign of virtue, when the enemies of God shall be confounded, and His people gathered from the utmost corners of the world to dwell in their own land. Then, he says, wars shall cease among men, and wild beasts shall forget their fierceness. And the scattered children of God shall return under the guidance "of a form (ὄψεως) more divine than that of man, unseen by others, and visible only to those who are being saved; and they shall find three advocates (παρακλήτους) of their reconciliation (καταλλαγῶν) with the Father: — Firstly, the kindness and goodness of [God] who invites them; . . . . secondly, the holiness of the patriarchs of their race; . . . . and thirdly, that, through which especially the favor of those things which have been mentioned prevents them, the reformation of those who are being led to a [new] truce and covenant, who have been able with difficulty to come from a pathless wandering to that path whose end is no other than to please God — as sons a father. Then shall the ruins of their cities be repaired; the prosperity of their fathers shall seem but little in comparison with the perennial springs of God's favor by which they will be cheered; and their enemies shall be filled with dismay and sorrow when they see the sure and unchangeable prosperity of God's people."[1]

[1] Philo, *de Execrat.* §§ 8, 9. Philo quotes, in his Messianic descriptions,

(b) Josephus. The type of a "temporizing" party.

While Philo cherished in this way a sure belief that his nation was destined to take the foremost place in the world, Josephus appears to abandon the trust in a national restoration, as well as that in a personal Saviour. Rome is acknowledged as the mistress of the world: Vespasian is proclaimed to be the king who should rise from the East. In a narrative of the early history and final struggle of the Jews, which become inexplicable without the recognition of the one central hope by which they were quickened, he never once betrays any personal interest, much less belief, in the doctrine of Messiah. Yet even thus he bears ample testimony to the powerful hold which it maintained on the nation. "When Fadus was procurator of Judæa," he relates, "a certain sorcerer (γόης), by name Theudas, persuaded the great mass of the people (τὸν πλεῖστον ὄχλον) to take up their property and follow him to the river Jordan, for he announced that he was a prophet, and said that he would divide the river by his command, and give them an easy passage; and saying this he deceived many;"[1] so faithfully did the nation cherish the recollection of their first deliverance as the image of that which should come. The same characteristic marks the history of "the Egyptian false prophet, who came into the country, being a sorcerer, and having persuaded men that he was a prophet, collected about thirty thousand of those whom he had deceived. And these he led from the wilderness to the Mount of Olives;"[2] . . . . "for he said that he wished to show them how at his bidding the walls of Jerusalem would fall, through which he promised that he would afford

Popular risings.

Levit. xxvi.; Deut. xxviii.; Numb. xxiv. 7; and also Isai. liv. 1; Ps. cxx. 8. Cf. Gfrörer, Philo, i. 532. Dähne, i. 432 ff. Possibly the "divine vision" may be an idealized antitype of the "pillar of fire" which attended the Jews on their first Exodus, in which the Word was present, but it by no means supports the identification of the Word and the Messiah, but rather distinguishes them.

1 Joseph. *Antiq.* xx. 4, 1.

2 Joseph. *B. J.* ii. 13, 5.

them an entrance into the city."[1] And these impostors were but specimens of a class of "vagabond men and deceivers, who, under the pretence of divine inspiration (θειασμοῦ), compassed revolutions and changes, and persuaded the multitude to indulge in mad hopes (δαιμονᾶν), and led them forth into the wilderness, as though God would show (? δείξοντος) them there signs of freedom," or, as it is expressed in the parallel passage, promising "to show evident prodigies and signs, wrought according to the foreknowledge of God."[2] The final insurrection is the clearest proof of the general spread of this Messianic enthusiasm, for Josephus allows that "that which especially incited the Jews to the war was an ambiguous oracle found in their sacred writings, to the effect 'that at that time one out of their country should rule the world (τῆς οἰκουμένης).'"[3] And even in the last extremity of the siege, "many prophets were sent by the chiefs among the common people, charging them to wait for the help of God;" and these found ready credence, so that six thousand fell in the porch of the temple, whither they had fled "expecting to receive the signs of safety."[4]

(c) Classical writers.

The hope entertained by the Jews was indeed so notorious that it did not escape the notice of Roman historians; and they attached so much importance to the predictions on which it was based, as to find their fulfilment in the elevation of Vespasian to the imperial throne. "A few," says Tacitus,

1 Joseph. *Antiq.* xx. 7, 6. In the other passage there is no allusion to this promised miracle.

2 Joseph. *ll. cc.* Josephus contrasts these fanatics with the zealots (λῃσταί, *sicarii*) as being "in hand more pure, but in purpose more impious." *B. J.* ii. 13, 4.

3 *B. J.* vi. 5, 4. The reference is probably to the prophecy of Daniel, and not to that of Balaam, as Bretschneider supposes, *Theolog. Fl. Josephi*, § 10. Cf. *Antiq.* x. 11, 7.

4 *B. J.* vi. 5, 2.

The paraphrase which Josephus gives of the promise to Abraham is characteristic: προοεδήλου τὸ γένος [τὸ] αὐτῶν εἰς ἔθνη πολλὰ καὶ πλοῦτον ἐπιδώσειν, καὶ μνήμην αἰώνιον αὐτῶν ἔσεσθαι τοῖς γενάρχαις (*Antiq.* i. 14, 4). But it is to be remembered that neither Philo nor the Targum understood this of Messiah.

in speaking of the prodigies which preceded the destruction of Jerusalem, "turned these events into a cause of alarm; the greater number were possessed with a belief that it was written in the ancient writings of the priests that it would come to pass at that very time, that the East would grow mighty, and that men proceeding from Judæa would gain the empire of the world. An ambiguous oracle, which had foretold [the fortunes of] Vespasian and Titus."[1] . . . . . Suetonius relates the same circumstance almost in the same words, adding, however, that the belief was ancient, uniform, and universally current throughout the East.

III. *The Messianic hope in the later Jewish writings.*

But however strong the hope was, even after the destruction of Jerusalem, it was quenched, at no distant time, in the blood of the noblest Jews. The disastrous rising of Barkokeba was the last public profession of the earlier creed. Afterwards a gloom settled over the image of Messiah, and increasing sorrows were described as the sure signs of His approach.

1. *The* Mishna.

The Eliezer, surnamed the Great, said:[2] "A little before the advent of Messiah[3] shamelessness shall be increased; and there shall be great dearth of corn; the vine shall bear fruit, but [from the excess of revellers] wine shall be sold dear. The mightiest empire in the world shall be overwhelmed with evil judgments, and no chastisement shall have place. The synagogues shall be converted into houses of shame; the borders of Judæa shall be laid waste, and all the region shall be made desolate. Noble men shall go round from town to town and meet with no offices of mercy. The wisdom of teachers shall seem of ill-savor; the innocent shall be

1 Tac. *Hist.* v. 13; Suet. *Vesp.* 4. Percrebuerat oriente toto vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis, ut eo tempore Judæa profecti rerum potirentur. The well-known passage, Suet. *Claud.* 25, Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes urbe expulit, may refer to the intrigues of some fanatics.

2 *Sota*, § 15 (iii. pp. 308–9, ed. Surenhus). Cf. Edzard, *Avoda Sara*, pp. 248 f.

3 בעקבות מ׳ *In calcaneis M.* Cf. Buxtf. *Lex. Rabb.* s. v. Wagenseil, l. c.

despised; and the failing of truth shall be great. Young men shall confound the face of the old; the old shall rise before the young. The son shall provoke the father; the daughter shall rise against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; in fine, every one shall have for his foes those of his own household. In truth, that age shall have the face of a dog, and the son shall not reverence his parent. On whom, then, must we trust? On our heavenly Father."[1]

This remarkable passage stands, I believe, alone in the Mishna;[2] but in the Gemara many other strange and inconsistent traditions occur, which seem at times more like the expression of despair than of faith. The "birth-pangs of Messias" passed into a proverb;[3] and some Rabbis declared that they wished not to behold His coming.[4] Drought, famine, thunder, and wars, were among the signs which should precede Him; and it was said that the sight of men should fail for anguish and sorrow. Nor was the moral state of the world expected to be better than the material. The divine teaching was to fail, and all men were to become Sadducees: "when men grow fewer and fewer," so the tradition runs, "expect Messias;[5] when the world is overwhelmed with evils as with a flood; when the last supply is consumed and the last hope gone."

2. *The* Gemara *(Talmud).*

The prevailing tone of these traditions is due in all probability to the disappointment of earlier dreams. Various limits had been fixed for the coming of Messiah, and, as Raf confessed, all were passed.[6] Some had likened the duration of the

The time *of Messiah's coming.*

1 Cf. Lactant. *Instit.* vii. 15 f.

2 Various opinions as to the coming and work of Elias are given: Edaj. s. f. (iv. p. 362).

3 חבלי של מז (ὠδῖνες, Matt. xxiv. 8; Mark xiii. 8).

4 Schöttg. ii. 546–7; 971. I have not verified Schöttgen's references, which however seem to be accurate. The Messianic interpretations of the Old Test. common to the New Test. and Jewish writers are given in Note (1) at the end of the chapter.

5 *Sanhedr.* 91, 1 (referring to 2 Sam. xxii. 28): Schöttg. ii. 154; 968.

6 Schöttg. ii. 966.

world to a week of heavenly days, six thousand years of trial and labor followed by a millennial sabbath.[1] Two thousand years, it was thought, elapsed before the Law, two thousand were to pass under the Law, and two thousand years were reserved for the victories of Messiah. Others thought that the world would last eighty-five years of Jubilee (4165 or 4250 years), and that Messiah would come in the last.[2] The Romans, it was said at one time, shall oppress Israel for nine months.[3] Others again measured four hundred years from the last desolation of the Holy City as the utmost limit of delay; but the time went by, and then men cried in despair, "Let his bones be broken who computes the limits of Messiah's coming."[4] Different explanations were proposed for the delay. The strangest fancy perhaps was that it was occasioned by the necessity for all the souls in the receptacle of spirits (Guph) to be embodied first;[5] but in some form or other it was generally referred to the sins of the people. "If Israel keep but one sabbath, or one fast duly, Messiah at length will come."[6] He came, according to another wild legend, on the day of the destruction of the Temple, but was suddenly carried away to be revealed at His proper time.[7] And with strange and tragic irony others said, He is even now sitting among the poor and wounded at the gates of Rome, and men know Him not.[8]

The manner.

The twofold description of Messiah's advent was explained by the different circumstances under which He might come. He would come, it was said, if the people were wholly good or wholly wicked; if good, then He would appear, according to the words of Daniel, on the clouds of heaven; if evil, then

1 Edzard, l. c. p. 66. This idea was popular with the Christian Fathers: cf. Barn. *Ep.* 15; Iren. v. 28, 3. Lactant. *Instit.* vii. 14, and *nott.*

2 Schöttg. ii. 963.

3 Id. 970.

4 Id. 965.

5 Edzard, p. 28. Cf. pp. 224 ff.

6 Edzard, p. 247.

7 *Midr. Echa.* 59, and *Jer. Berach.* 5, 1. Cf. Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth.* 404 n. Cf. Targ. Mic. iv. 8.

8 Schöttg. ii. 969. Edzard, p. 254, or, as others said, in *Eden* (id. l. c.).

meek and lowly, as foretold by Zechariah.[1] As to the nature of His kingdom, the later tradition in one respect was uniform. There will be no difference, it was said, between these days and the days of Messias, except in the subjugation of the Gentiles.[2] But as to its duration opinions widely differed. Passages were quoted from the Prophets which appeared to fix forty or seventy years, or three generations, or a thousand, or seven thousand years for its continuance.[3] And "in those days the Nazarites shall drink wine;" and "there shall be no more proselytes;" but "all the Gentiles of their own accord shall be brought to Messiah," and "all shall be clean."[4] Thus some said, "in the days of Messiah there will be thirteen tribes, and the thirteenth will be Messiah's;" but others again doubted whether the ten tribes would be restored.[5]

3. *Other Jewish works.*

The later Jewish books contribute some further details as to the expectation of Messiah, though perhaps little stress can be laid upon their originality.[6] It is said that a new Elias, born, like the first, of barren parents, will herald His approach by a preaching of repentance, according to some only three days before Messiah.[7] Messiah Himself will appear in the North, and His advent will be marked by a star.[8] Moses and Elias will attend Him, and He "will stand upon the roof of the Temple;" and the Shekinah will continue with men for three years and a half.[9] The same Passover night which witnessed the chief crises in the fortunes of the human race will also witness Messiah's coming.[10] And

1 Schöttg. ii. 969. In this connection (Zech. xii. 10—12) the idea of a Messiah, "the son of Joseph," was first entertained: *Succa Bab.* 52. Cf. Gfrörer, ii. 258 ff. Infr. p. 160, n. 9. The death of Messias is admitted in 4 Esdr. vii.; supr. p. 107.

2 Edzard, p. 208. Cf. Gfrörer, *Jahrh. d. Heils*, i. 219. Bertholdt, p. 41.

3 Schöttg. ii. p. 973. 4 Id. pp. 613 ff.

5 Schöttg. ii. p. 207 (fr. Ezek. xlviii. 19). Cf. Sanhedr. c. xi. 3. Targ. Zech. x. 4. 4, Esdr. xiii.; supr. p. 131.

6 The preëxistence of Messiah is taught in the later writings. It was "the Spirit of Messiah which brooded over the waters at the creation." Cf. Nork, p. ix. and nott.

7 Schöttg. ii. p. 533.

8 Id. pp. 538, 531.

9 Id. pp. 544, 188, 548.

10 Jerome mentions this "Jewish

some speak of a mediatorial death and exaltation, of a resurrection of the patriarchs and of the just, of the removal of the Redeemer (Goel) to heaven.[1] Then all the feast-days will be abolished except the day of atonement, and sacrifices shall cease, and there will be no distinction of clean and unclean.[2] The kingdom of Messiah will be strong in spite of the banded heathen. The oppressors of Israel will be destroyed, and all others made to do service to God's chosen people. Then the blessings of Eden will be restored; all creation will be relieved from the consequences of man's sin; and God will walk as in old times among His people, and man will not fly from the presence of His Maker.[3]

4. *The* mystic *literature of the Jews.*

There is still another form of Jewish literature which has exerted a powerful influence upon the later doctrine of Messiah, but it is uncertain whether the mystic teaching of the Kabbala was directed in any degree towards the subject at the beginning of the Christian era. Mysticism and philosophy looked first within rather than without for the fulfilment of the aspirations which they cherished; and they probably received from Christianity the impulse by which their later course was shaped.[4]

tradition" as the ground of the "Apostolic tradition" of the watchings of Easter-eve — the *nox vigiliarum* (*Comm. in Matt.* xxv. 6). The passages referring to this usage are given by Bingham, *Antiq.* xxi. 1, 32. Schöttg. ii. pp. 531, 563.

1 Schöttg. ii. pp. 566, 578 ff, 595. The notion of a "suffering Messiah" belongs exclusively to a late period. He appears as *the son of Joseph or Ephraim*, as opposed to *the son of David;* but the earliest trace of this belief occurs in the *Babyl. Gemara.* Cf. Targ. Cant. iv. 5; (Jerus.) Ex. xl. 11. Pearson *On the Creed*, 164 *note;* Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, ii. 324; Gfrörer, ii. 262; 270-1. Cf. infr. p. 160, on *Zohar.*

2 Schöttg. ii. pp 612 ff.

3 Gfrörer, *Jahrh. d. Heils*, i. pp. 413 f. Buxtorf's essay, *De Messia venturo* (*de Synag. Jud.* c. 1. Ugolini, *Thes.* iv.), contains very little of importance, but gives a curious description of the ten expected signs of Messiah (pp. 1154 ff.), of the ten consolations (pp. 1160 ff.), and of the great feast which should mark His advent (pp. 1162 ff.).

I have collected in a note at the end of the chapter the Messianic passages quoted in the New Testament, which are interpreted in the same manner in Jewish writings.

4 Cf. Zunz, cap. ix. xxi.

Like other Eastern nations, the Jews were naturally inclined to theosophic speculation, and though this tendency may have been repressed by the definite teaching of revelation as long as they were confined within the sacred boundaries of Palestine, it found a freer scope after the exile. The prophecies of Ezekiel suggested a congenial subject for mystical interpretation. In their general imagery they appeared to reflect the symbols of a strange nation, and to invite the study of Eastern wisdom. The Vision of the Divine glory — the chariot-throne on which the Lord was seen by the river of Chebar — formed the text for the inquiry into the essence and majesty of God; as the narrative of Genesis seemed to contain under a veil the secrets of creation. Round these two centres — the manifestation of God's glory in Himself and in Creation — Theology and Nature — fancies and thoughts clustered, and at length gained consistency. Enthusiasts saw the shadows of their own dreams in the divine history of their nation, and fancied that the patriarchs were their teachers. Whatever they felt to be true in foreign systems was found latent in some symbolic word or number. All inward and outward experience was held to be only a commentary on the fulness of the Law and the Prophets.

The origin of this literature.

Ezek. i.

Its great subdivisions.

The progress of mysticism is generally the same: a vague aspiration, a pregnant word, a tradition, gathering form and fulness in the lapse of time, an incongruous system, treasured in the secret discipline of schools, and at length committed to writing. And such was the history of the Kabbala.[1] Already, in the Apocryphal books of the Old Testament, there are

Its growth.

1 The name belongs to a much later period. The root is *kabal*, *to receive* [*by tradition*], and the word was originally applied to all the books of the Old Testament besides the Pentateuch (Zunz, 44 n.; cf. ed. 402, n.); and even after the technical sense of the word was established, it was still commonly used for "oral tradition" in the 13th and 14th centuries (Zunz, l. c.).

traces of the recognition of esoteric wisdom in the "Chariot" and the "Creation;" and at Alexandria the new theory found a rapid and natural development.[1] In Palestine and Babylon the same teaching spread, but under close restrictions. It was forbidden for any one under thirty years of age to read the Vision of Ezekiel. The public exposition of the "works of creation" or of the "chariot" was unlawful,[2] and single hearers were selected with special care. The very form of instruction was enigmatic. The truth was expressed in short "sentences for thinking men;" principles only were given, and not the application of them.

Earlier speculations are at length committed to writing.

As long as the Kabbala remained in this form, it is evident that it must have continued subject to external influences. Its teaching included the knowledge of all mysteries; and as Christianity most truly purified the speculations of the Neo-Platonists and the polytheism of Julian, so also it must have modified the secrets of Jewish tradition. The philosopher, the statesman, and the mystic, would have shrunk equally from the conscious appropriation of Christian doctrine; but some principles, when once enunciated, approve themselves so certainly to the heart and reason, that it becomes a question afterwards whether they spring from revelation or from intuition. Thus open on one side to the Persian doctrine of emanation, and on the other to the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation, the Kabbala grew in silence, till at last, in the seventh or eighth centuries, the traditionary dogmas were embodied in written commentaries.[3] Of these, two remain widely separated in the times of their redaction, but both probably were based on traditions of equal antiquity. The *Sepher*

1 Zunz, pp. 162, 163. *Sirac.* xlix. 10. There are in the Talmud traces of the existence of secret interpretations of the *Mercaba* and *Bereshith*, Zunz, 164.

2 Mishna, *Chagiga*, c. ii., § 1. Non exponunt . . . . opera creationis cum duobus neque currum cum uno, nisi fuerit sapiens qui sensum intelligit.

3 Zunz, 165.

Jetsira, or *Book of the Creation*, dates, in its present form, from about the eighth century:[1] the *Sepher ha Zohar*, or *Book of Splendor*, owes its existence to R. Moses of Leon in the thirteenth century.[2]

False interpretations of Zohar.

It follows, from what has been already said, that little stress can be laid on the passing coincidences between the Kabbalistic books and the New Testament. In their fundamental principles, the two present a total contrast. The *Jetsira* develops a system of pantheism utterly at variance with Christianity; and the same pantheism lies at the basis of Zohar. At the same time speculations on the Divine Nature are necessarily so vague, that recent theologians have found in Zohar the whole of Christianity. The two natures of Messiah, and His threefold office, are said to be symbolized in the tree of the ten *Sephiroth*, and in the *Chariot*;[3] and those more abstruse questions as to the Person of Christ, which agitated and divided the Church, are said to be anticipated and decided in the mystical dogmas of Simeon ben Jochai.

1 Zunz, 165, who gives numerous examples of later idioms and words. The Talmud contains a reference to a *Sepher Jetsira*, which Zunz supposes to be an error for *Halcoth Jetsira* mentioned elsewhere (p. 464 n.). Popular tradition ascribes its authorship to R. Akiba, or even to Abraham. In the absence of an exact criticism of its composition it is impossible to fix the date of its first elements. Cf. Jellinek, *Beiträge zur Gesch. d. Kabbala*, i. Leipsic, 1852.

2 This has been satisfactorily established by Jellinek in his tract, *Moses ben Schemtob de Leon und sein verhältniss zum Sohar*, Leipsic, 1851. The warm approval of Jost is sufficient to remove any lingering doubt as to the correctness of Jellinek's conclusion: *A. Jellinek und die Kabbala*, Leipsic, 1852. Cf. Zunz, pp. 404 f. Jellinek detects the presence of nine different authors in the present work (Jost, p. 10); and it is impossible not to hope for some clear results from his later studies.

The other opinions as to the origin of *Zohar* are given by Joel, *Die Religions-philosophie des Sohar*, 1849, pp. 61 ff.

3 Schöttg. ii. pp. 294 ff.; 350 ff.; 366 ff. His arguments rest on the convertibility of the terms *Shekinah*, *Metatron*, etc., with *Messiah*, which seems to be unwarranted. Messiah is comparatively rarely mentioned by name, and where the title occurs there is little to justify the identification. Cf. Schöttg. ii. pp. 267, 278, 289, 412, 413. The most remarkable passage (p. 341) seems to have but little of a Christian tone. The passages here referred to maintain expressly the twofold Messias — the Son of David and the Son of Ephraim: cf. p. 360.

Authentic Messianic traditions.

The direct and unquestionable traditions as to Messiah, which are embodied in Zohar, are more interesting. He is to be revealed first in Galilee,[1] coming from the garden of Eden; and a star in the East is to herald His approach: the land which was first laid waste by invaders is to receive first its consolation.[2] He is to spring from the race of Boaz and David;[3] and the dove which brought to Noah the tidings that the flood had abated shall hover over Him, and place a crown upon His head.[4] To Him the little ones shall be gathered, and He shall collect the captives from all the corners of the earth.[5] He shall enter Jerusalem, according to the prophet, riding on an ass;[6] and "drink the cup" of suffering as men;[7] and Messias, the son of Joseph (or Ephraim), shall die, and rise again; and the dead shall be raised.[8]

The indirect influence of these speculations.

But while it is impossible to show that the mysticism which gave this form to the doctrine of Messiah after the Christian era had led to any clear conception of a suffering Saviour before His Advent,[9] it unconsciously prepared the way for a true recognition of His Divine nature. Even in the Pentateuch there are traces of a revealed as well as of a hidden God, of one on whom man may look and still live, of an angel (*Maleach*) who exercises the functions of deity. This conception of the external manifestation of the Deity was

1 The reason alleged is given by Jerome (*Comm. in Matt.* v. 16) ut ubi Israelis fuerat ab Assyriis prima captivitas, ibi redemptoris præconium nasceretur.

2 Schöttg. ii. 524, 525; i. ii.

3 Id. ii. 525.

4 Id. p. 537.

5 Id. pp. 541, 542.

6 Id. p. 543.

7 Id. pp. 112, 550.

8 Id. pp. 557, 565, 572.

Schöttgen in his *Lectiones Rabbinicæ* ii. §§ 8 ff. endeavors to establish that R. Simeon b. Jochai — the reputed author of *Zohar*, — must have been a Christian, from the summary of his teaching. An answer of Glæssner is appended, with a rejoinder of Schöttgen, but nevertheless his case seems quite insufficient.

In note (2) at the end of the chapter some account of the later *Samaritan* Christology is given.

9 Friedrich's refutation of Bertholdt's argument in support of the ante-Christian doctrine of a suffering Messiah, may be added to the other references which have been given on this subject: *Discuss. de Christol. Samar. Lib.* Lips. 1821, pp. 12 ff.

followed in the later books by a corresponding representation of His invisible energy. In the Book of Proverbs, Wisdom (*Khokma*, σοφία) appears in some degree to fill up the chasm between God and the world; and in the Apocryphal writings this mediative element is apprehended with greater distinctness, but at the same time only partially, and with a tendency to pantheistic error. Meanwhile the growing belief in an angel-world, composed of beings of the most different natures and offices, gave consistency to the idea of a Power standing closer to God than the mightiest among the created hosts. The doctrine thus grounded fell in exactly with the desire of the philosophic interpreters of Scripture to remove from the text the anthropomorphic representations of the Supreme Being; and with varied ingenuity and deep insight into the relations of the creature and the Creator, the finite and the Infinite, they constructed the doctrine of the Word (*Memra*, λόγος).

IV. *The doctrine of the* Word.

The belief in a divine Word, a mediating Power by which God makes Himself known to men in action and teaching, was not confined to any one school at the time of Christ's coming. It found acceptance alike at Jerusalem and Alexandria, and moulded the language of the Targums as well as the speculations of Philo. But there was a characteristic difference in the form which the belief assumed. In Palestine the Word appears, like the Angel of the Pentateuch, as the medium of the outward communication of God with men; in Egypt, as the inner power by which such communication is rendered possible. The one doctrine tends towards the recognition of a divine Person subordinate to God;[1] the other, to the recognition of a twofold personality in the divine essence.

1. *In* Palestine.

The earliest Palestinian view of the Word is given in the Targum of Onkelos. In this it is said

1 Yet the personal *Metatron* was created. Cf. Dorner, i. 60.

the Lord protected Noah by His Word when he entered the Ark: that He *made a covenant between Abraham and His Word:* that *the Word of the Lord was with Ishmael* in the wilderness; with Abraham at Beersheba; with Isaac when he went among the Philistines; with Joseph in Egypt. At Bethel, Jacob made a covenant that *the Word of the Lord should be his God.* Moses, at Sinai, *brought forth the people to meet the Word of God.* In the Book of Deuteronomy, again, the Word of the Lord appears as *a consuming fire*, *talking* to His people *from the midst of the mount*, and fighting for them against their enemies; and the same image recurs in the Targum of Jonathan on the books of Joshua and Samuel.

The Targum of Onkelos.

Gen. vii. 16.

Gen. xv. 1; *xvii.* 2.

Gen. xxi. 20.

Gen. xxviii. 20.

Exod. xix. 17.

Deut. iii. 2; *iv.* 24.

In the later Targums on the Pentateuch, the works of the Word are brought out more plainly. He creates man, and blesses him, and detects his fall. By Him Enoch is translated, and Hagar comforted. He appears to Abraham in the plains of Mamre, and provides the ram for him on Moriah. He is present with Jacob at Bethel, in Haran, and in the going down to Egypt. At the Exodus He destroys the first-born of the Egyptians, and delivers His people with mighty signs, and becomes their king.[1]

The later Targums.

1 In due connection with the *Memra* is the *Shekinah*, the one regarding the active operation of God, the other His visible presence. The *Shekinah*, however, is rarely mentioned in the Targums [*e. g.* Ex. xxv. 8; Num. v. 3, "the Shekinah of the Lord" (Onkelos); and more frequently in the later Targums. Cf. Buxtf. *Lex. Rabb. s. v.* Gen. ix. 27, already quoted, p. 111 n. 1 offers the most remarkable example of the introduction of the Shekinah], but frequently in *Zohar;* while the title *Memra* is exclusively confined to the Targums, or immediately derived from it. In some parallel passages of the Targum both terms occur. Thus in Num. xxiii. 21, Onkelos paraphrases: The Word of the Lord shall be their help, and the Shekinah of their King among them; and Pseudo-Jonathan: The Word of the Lord shall be their help, and the triumphal strain of King Messias shall sound among them. Again, in Ex. xx. 24, the Shekinah in Onkelos replaces the Word of the Lord in Pseudo-Jonathan. And conversely in Ex. xix. 17; Deut. xxiii. 14, Shekinah in the Pseudo-Jonathan answers to the Word of the Lord in Onkelos.

The first of the passages just quoted has been brought forward to establish

2. *In* Egypt. PHILO. *The variety and inconsistency of Philo's views.*

The representation of the nature and functions of the Word in Philo is far removed from the simplicity of this recognition of an outward Mediator. Various influences combined to modify his doctrine, and the enunciation of it is perplexed and inconsistent. The very title, Logos, with its twofold meaning, speech and reason, was a fruitful source of ambiguity;[1] and this first confusion was increased by the tempting analogies of Greek philosophy in conflict with the Hebrew faith in the absolute unity of God. As a necessary consequence, the Logos is described under the most varied forms. At one time it is the mind of God in which the archetypal world exists, as the design of an earthly fabric in the mind of the architect.[2] At another time it is the inspirer of holy men, the spring and food of virtue. At another time it is the Son of God, the First-born, all-pervading, all-sustaining, and yet personally distinct from God. At another time the conception of two distinct divine personalities yields to the ancient dogma, and the Logos, while retaining its divine attributes, is regarded only as a special conception of God, as reasoning, acting, creating.

Philo's interpretations compared with those in the Targums.

The contrast between the wavering conceptions of Philo and the simple statement of the Targumists is seen clearly in the passages where they recognize in common the presence of

the identity of the Word of the Lord with Messiah, [Schöttgen iii. 5, 6; Bertholdt § 24. The passage quoted by the latter (note 3) from Targ. Jon. Is. xlii. 1, is differently given by Schöttgen iii. 431; *in quo Verbum meum* (majestas mea) *sibi complacet*]; but even if it were less equivocal it could have but little weight against the whole tenor of early Jewish writings. Not only is the proposed interpretation doubtful, but elsewhere unparalleled. It is worthy of notice that the eight names of Messiah given in the *Midrash Mischle* (xiith cent.) on the authority of R. Huna (†290 A.D.) contain nothing to identify Him with the Word or Shekinah. Compare the names given by Philo *de confus. ling.* § 28. The union of the Shekinah with Messiah is taught in *Zohar*. Cf. Bertholdt, § 24, n. 3.

1 The distinction is recognized in the contrast of the λόγος προφορικός and the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος, *de vita Mos.* iii. 12 (ii. p. 154).

2 *De mund. opif.* § 4 ff. (i. pp. 4 ff.) The whole passage is most characteristic and instructive.

the Logos in the narrative of the Pentateuch. Philo speaks of the Logos as that through which the world was created,[1] but at the same time as an "instrument" (ὄργανον),[2] "which still, in after time, the pilot of the universe handles as a rudder, and so steers the course of all things."[3] The angel which met Hagar was "the divine Word," but Hagar is said to be "routine learning" (ἡ μέση καὶ ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία), which twice flying from the presence of sovereign virtue (Sarah) is brought back by the divine Word to the house of her Lord.[4] Jacob met the Word of God at Bethel, even one of those "Words which God sends to bring help to the lovers of virtue.[5] "An angel, a servant of God, the Word, changed the name of Jacob, but the unalterable God changed the name of Abraham."[6] . . . The Word was the cloud which separated the hosts of Israel and Egypt, to whom "the Father who created (γεννήσας) the universe assigned the special gift, that standing on the confines He should separate the created (τὸ γενόμενον) from Him that made it. The same is at once the suppliant of the mortal ever pining (κηραίνοντος) for the incorruptible, and the envoy of the prince to the subject. Moreover, he rejoices in the gift, and, magnifying himself, sets it forth, saying: And I stood between the Lord and you, being neither unbegotten as God, nor begotten as you, but a mean between the extremes, in contact (ὁμηρεύων) with both."[7]

Even from these examples — and they might be multiplied indefinitely — it is evident that Philo had no uniform

1 *De Monard.* § 5 (i. p. 225).

2 *Leg. Alleg.* i. § 9 (i. p. 47); iii. § 31 (i. p. 106). *De Cherub.* § 35 (i. p. 162).

3 *De Migr. Abr.* § 1 (i. p. 437).

4 *De Cherub.* § i. (i. p. 138) Cf. *de Prof.* § 37 (i. p. 576).

5 *De Somn.* § 12, i. p. 631. The plural form (λόγοι) is worthy of notice. It occurs in the simplest sense in *Leg. Alleg.* § 62, i. p. 122, where οἱ ἄγγελοι καὶ λόγοι are contrasted with αὐτὸς ὁ ὤν. The treatise *de post. Cain.* §§ 6, 25, 26 (i. pp. 229. 241, 242) contains a very interesting series of examples of its usage.

6 *De mut. nom.* § 13 (i. p. 591).

7 *Quis rer. div. hær.* § 42 (i. p. 501). With the language here used compare the title δεύτερος θεός quoted from Philo by Eusebius, *Præp. Ev.* vii. 13. This title is indeed implied in *Leg. Alleg.* § 73 (i. p. 128).

and distinct doctrine of the Logos. The term in its manifold senses continually rules his thoughts, and he deals with this more frequently than with the great idea to which it was properly applied. An apparent analogy, a striking incident, a passing phrase is sufficient to modify his statement and direct the course of his reasoning. With him speculation had arrived at that stage in which language domineers over thought. But though it is impossible to decide absolutely that Philo attributed to the Word a personal and divine essence, and still more to bring all his statements into harmony with one dogmatic scheme, there is, nevertheless, a general tendency towards one issue among the conflicting details which his writings contain, one great current of thought which can be traced throughout them in spite of the manifold eddies by which it is disturbed. When he writes most independently he assigns to the Logos divine attributes[1] and personal action;[2] and at the same time he affirms, in the most decided manner, the absolute indivisibility of the divine nature.[3] The Word is neither an emanation nor a created being, but rather God Himself under a particular form, conceived as the source and centre of vital energy. Combined with his other teaching, this view naturally leads to the conception of a twofold personality in the Godhead. Even while he shrinks from the recognition of such a doctrine,[4] his arguments must have led men to reflect upon it; and in this way, without laying the actual foundation for the truth, he prepared the ground on which it might be laid.

In the midst of the variety of Philo's opinions, one general tendency may be traced.

But the preparation which Philo made for the Gospel

1 As the creation *de Monarch.* § 5, ii. 225, and preservation of the Universe, *Frag.* ii. p. 655. ὁ θεῖος λόγος περιέχει τὰ πάντα καὶ πεπλήρωκεν. Cf. *Quis rer. div. hær.* § 38, i. p. 499, *de Profugis*, § 20, i. p. 562.

2 As the ἀρχιερεύς, *de Somn.* § 37, i. 653; εἰκὼν θεοῦ, *de mund. opif.* § 8, i. 6, etc.; ἡμῶν τῶν ἀτελῶν θεός, *Leg. Alleg.* § 73, i. 128; ὕπαρχος *de Somn.* § 41, i. 656; cf. i. 308.

3 *Quod det. potiori. insid.* § 24, i. 209.

4 *De Somn.* § 39, i. 655.

was purely theological and speculative. His idea of the Logos was wholly disconnected from all Messianic hopes.[1] It was in fact, to a great degree, a philosophical substitute for them. Philo may have conceived of the Word as acting through Messiah, but not as one with Him. The lines of thought which pointed to the action of a second Person in the Godhead, and the victories of some future human conqueror, were not even parallel, but divergent. It was reserved for St. John to combine the antithetic truths in one short divine phrase. Then, for the first time, God, Man, Shekinah, Word, were placed together in the most simple and sublime union: *The Word was God*, and *the Word was made man and tabernacled among us*.[2]

Yet the doctrine of the Word *remained wholly unconnected with that of the* Messiah.

John i. 14.

Little still remains to be said as to the relation which the Messianic hope, which has been now traced in its various forms and bearings, bore to its fulfilment. One or two points, however, which are often overlooked in a mass of detail, may deserve some notice. And the first thing which must strike any one who has observed the manifold sources from which the several traits of Messiah's person have been drawn, is the fragmentariness of the special conceptions formed of Him. Most of the separate elements, of which the whole truth consisted, were known, but they were kept distinct. One feature was taken for the complete image; and the only temper which excluded all error was that of simple and devout expectation.

General summary.

The fragmentariness of the Jewish hope.

Yet while the results of the long and anxious thought of the people were thus partial and uncombined, each suc-

1 On this point the testimony of Origen is most important, *c. Cels.* ii. 31, ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ πολλοῖς Ἰουδαίοις καὶ σοφοῖς γε ἐπαγγελομένοις εἶναι συμβαλὼν οὐδενὸς ἀκήκοα ἐπαινοῦντος τὸ λόγον εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς ὁ Κέλσος εἴρηκε. . . . .

2 Cf. Apoc. xxi. 3 (*shakan*, *habitavit* = σκηνόω, Jud. viii. 11, etc.

ceeding generation added something to the heritage of the past, and made a wider faith possible. Step by step the majesty of Messiah was traced in nobler lines, in Henoch and Esdras; and if the subtle speculations of the Hellenists on the action and revelation of God had no direct Messianic application, they familiarized the minds of men with thoughts essential to the apprehension of the doctrine of an Incarnation.

Its progressiveness.

"Everything was ready" for the work, but the work of the Spirit was not yet done. The essentially divine nature of Messiah was not acknowledged. The import of His human nature was not felt. The full character of His work with regard to man, to the nation, to the world, was not apprehended. The consciousness of personal sin, turning the mind of the believer to the thought of a new birth, was hardly awakened. The adoption of the nations to be joint-heirs with Israel to a spiritual kingdom must have seemed impossible till man's personal relation to God was fully recognized. And the wider effects of redemption could be regarded only as material blessings till the full bearing of redemption on mankind was realized. Yet men were everywhere "feeling after" the truth which lay near to them. And as it is impossible to conceive that any Jew could have pictured to himself Christ as He really came, so it is equally impossible to imagine any other Saviour, who could have satisfied all the wants which were felt at the time of His coming.

Its defects.

Times of triumph and sorrow, the government of judges, kings, and priests, the open manifestation of divine power and the brilliant display of human courage, the teaching of prophets and the teaching of experience, the concentration of Eastern meditation and the activity of Western thought, the skepticism of learning and the enthusiasm of hope, each form of discipline and each phase of speculation, had contributed

Yet the preparation was completed.

to bring out into clear forms upon one narrow stage the spiritual capacities and aspirations of men. Everything was ready, and a brief space was sufficient for the prophetic work of Messiah. Disciples were waiting to recognize Him; enemies had already rejected Him. His words found everywhere a direct and characteristic application. His presence was an instantaneous test of all that was partial or transitory. The simple announcement of His Advent was the Gospel; the record of His works and words in various scenes and before various classes, the fulness of its special adaptations, not for one time only, but for all times. For the manifoldness of the elements which were combined in the Jewish people at Christ's coming provided not only for the rapidity of its comprehension, but also for the typical completeness of its history. And the narratives of this history, in their origin and growth, in their common harmony and special differences, in their fruitful combinations and distinct individuality, will now claim our attention. The voice and power of the Saviour lives in them, and it is no false reverence which bids us "fly to the Gospels as unto the Body" (σαρκί) — the very outward manifestation — "of Christ."[1]

1 Ign. *ad Philad.* 5.

NOTES ON CHAPTER II.

NOTE I. — MESSIANIC PROPHECIES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT COMPARED WITH THE CORRESPONDING INTERPRETATIONS OF JEWISH COMMENTATORS.

Of the ninety-four passages from the Old Testament which are quoted in a Messianic sense by the Apostolic writers, I have not been able to trace more than forty-four which are interpreted in the same manner in Jewish writings. Many of these, however, are important, and all are interesting as throwing a general light upon the system of Jewish interpretation.

Isai. vii. 14;	Matt. i. 23, 24.	Not applied to Messiah by the Jews: Schöttg. ii. 159; nor yet the name *Immanuel*. The words were referred at an early time to Hezekiah: Cf. Just. M. *Dial.* §§ 68, 71, 77. *Sanhedr.* 98. Pearson *On the Creed*, pp. 323—324 (ed. Cambr.). Hengstenberg, *Christology*, i. p. 63 (Eng. Tr.).
Mic. v. 2;	— ii. 6.	Explained in the same way in *Targum* (ad loc.). *Pirke R. Eliezer.* So also Kimchi and Abarbanel (Schöttg. ii. 213). Cf. Tertull. *c. Jud.* xiii. Just. M. *Apol.* i. § 34. It is doubtful whether any other interpretation was ever current: Hengstenberg, i. 187.
Jer. xxxi. 15;	— ii. 18.	[Cf. *Zohar*, ad Gen. 100 (Schöttg. ii. 448); and ad Exod. 3 (Schöttg. i. 4)].
Isai. xl. 3;	— iii. 3.	[Cf. *Pesikta Sotarta*, 58, ad Num. xxiv. 17 (Schöttg. ii. 97; 141).]
— ix. 12;	— iv. 15, 16.	Not till *Jalkut Sim.* ii. 182 (Schöttg. ii. 160.)
— liii. 4;	— viii. 17.	*Sanhedr.* 98. Schöttg. ii. 183. For the history of the interpretation, compare Hengstenberg, ii. 311 ff.
Mal. iii. 1;	— xi. 10.	*Tanchuma*, 66 (Schöttg. i. 111): God said: As there were spies in the Old Testament, so shall there be in the times of the New Testament, a messenger to prepare my way before me, as it is written. Cf. *Schemoth R.* 131. *Debarim R.* 256, in connection with Is. xl. 4 (Schöttg. ii. 224).

Isai. xlii. 1—4;	Matt. xii. 18—21.	So *Targum.* Kimchi, Abarbanel. Cf. *Midrash Tehillim*, 23 (Schöttg. ii. 113), *Pesikta R.* (Schöttg. ii. 130). Cf. Hengstenberg, ii. 197.
Zech. ix. 9;	— xxi. 5.	*Sanhedr.* 98; *Berachoth*, 56; *Pirke R. Eliezer*, 31 (Schöttg. ii. 220). In *Midr. Scham.* 66, there is a comparison of the first Goel (Moses: Ex. iv. 20) with the second (Schöttg. *l. c.*). Cf. *Bereshith R.* 98 (Schöttg. ii. 1045); Schöttg. i. 169; ii. 136, 139.
Ps. cxvii. 22;	— xxi. 42.	No trace in old writers (Schöttg. i. 173, 174), but so applied in *Zohar* and later commentators: Schöttg. ii. 87, 88, 106, 107, 140, 290, 334, 407, 609.
— cix. 1;	— xxii. 44.	*Midr. Tehil.* ad loc. (Schöttg. i. 192; ii. 246). *Bereshith R.* 83, ad Gen. xxxviii. 18, quotes v. 3 of Messiah (Schöttg. i. 192).
— xxi. 1, 18;	— xxvii. 35, 46.	The Psalm generally was so applied in later writings: *Pesikta R. Midr. Tehil.*
Isai. liv. 13;	John vi. 45.	*Pesikta R.; Bereshith R.; Schemoth R.; Debarim R.* (Schöttg. ii. 185, 65, 67).
— lii. 1;	— xii. 38.	No trace; but see *Sanhedr.* 98, quoted above.
Zech. xii. 10;	— xix. 37.	*Succa* 52, of Messiah *the son of Joseph.* So Kimchi.
Joel ii. 28—32;	Acts ii. 17—21.	*Siphri* (Schöttg. ii. 210). *Bammidbar R.* 231. *Tanchuma*, 14.
Gen. xxii. 18;	— iii. 25.	*Bammidbar R.* 184 (Schöttg. ii. 67) gives a different interpretation.
Ps. ii. 1, 2;	— iv. 25, 26.	*Mechilta* 3. *Pirke R. Eliezer*, 28. *Avoda Sara*, 3 (Schöttg. ii. 227, 228).
— 7;	— xiii. 33.	*Midr. Tehil.; Bereshith R.* (Schöttg. ii. 228, 104).
Isai. xlix. 6;	— 47.	*Bereshith R.* (Schöttg. ii. 102).
Amos ix. 11, 12;	— xv. 16, 17.	*Sanhedr.* 96. The name of Messiah is said to be *filius cadentis.*
Isai. viii. 14;	Rom. ix. 32, 33.	*Sanhedr.* 38 (Schöttg. ii. 160).
— lii. 7;	— x. 15.	*Pesikta R. Vajikra R. Bereshith R.* (Schöttg. ii. 179, 100).
Ps. xviii. 4;	— x. 18.	No trace in early writings. *Zohar* (Schöttg. ii. 230).
Isai. lix. 20, 21;	— xi. 26, 27.	*Sanhedr.* 98. *Bereshith R.* 37 (Schöttg. ii. 187, 184).

Isai. xi. 10;	Rom. xv. 12.	*Targum. Sanhedr.* 93. Rashe. Kimchi. Abarbanel (Schöttg. ii. 161).
— lxiv. 4;	— 1 Cor. ii. 9.	*Pesikta R. Schemoth R.* (Schöttg. ii. 195).
	— x. 4.	Cf. *Targ.* Isai. xvi. 1.
Ps. cix. 1;	— xv. 25.	Cf. supra.
Levit. xxvi. 11, 12;	2 Cor. vi. 16.	*Pesikta Sotarta*, 34. *Tanchuma* (Schöttg. ii. 150).
Deut. xxi. 23;	Gal. iii. 13.	Cf. Schöttg. ad loc.
Isai. liv. 1;	— iv. 27.	*Gibborim*, 49 (Schöttg. i. 749). *Bereshith R.* 37 (Schöttg. ii. 384).
— lvii. 19;	Eph. ii. 17.	Only in *Zohar:* Schöttg. ii. 115.
Ps. xliv. 6, 7;	Hebr. i. 8, 9.	*Targum.* So Aben Ezra (Schöttg. i. 924).
Isai. viii. 17, 18.	— ii. 13.	Cf. Schöttg. i. 933? from Isai. xlii. 1.
Ps. xciv. 7—11.	— iii. 7—11.	*Midr. Tehil.* 36. *Shir hashirim.* 25 (Schöttg. ii. 243).
— cix. 4;	— v. 6.	No Jewish writer regarded Melchizedek as a type of Christ (Schöttg. i. 949). Cf. Schöttg. ii. 645 for a spurious passage from *Bereshith R.*
Jer. xxxi. 31—34,	— viii. 8—12.	*Pesikta R.* (Schöttg. i. 970).
Hab. ii. 3, 4;	— x. 37, 38.	*Sanhedr.* 97 (Schöttg. ii. 215).
Hagg. ii. 7;	— xii. 26.	*Debarim R.* 250 (Schöttg. ii. 217; cf. 75).
Isai. xxviii. 16;	1 Pet. ii. 3.	*Targum?* Cf. Schöttg. ii. 170. So Rashe.
— liii. 9, 4;	— ii. 22, 24.	Cf. supra.
Dan. vii. 13;	Apoc. i. 7, 13.	*Sanhedr.* 98 (Schöttg, i. 1151).
Zech. xii. 10—12.	— i. 7.	Cf. supra.
Ps. ii. 9;	— ii. 27.	Cf. supra.

The above list is derived almost exclusively from Schöttgen, and not from the original authorities, nor have I verified the references, but it will be found, I trust, sufficiently accurate to serve as the basis of further investigations. The history of the later Jewish doctrine of the Messiah is at present as confused and unsatisfactory as that of earlier date.

Since the preceding chapter was written I have read Jost's later history (*Geschichte des Judenthums*, i. Leipsic, 1857). The account which he gives of the Jewish Messianic hope at the time of our Lord (pp. 394—402) seems to me to omit several important features; and while the Christian scholar will gratefully acknowledge his candor and largeness of view, yet his conception of the rise of Christianity is necessarily imperfect in its essence. His arguments have not induced me to change any of my conclusions; and, in spite of his criticism, I still think that Ewald has apprehended most fully the nature of the elements in Judaism, which contributed to form the foundation of a Catholic Church.

NOTE II. — THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE SAMARITANS.

The narrative of St. John (c. iv.), and the ready welcome which was afterwards given by the people of Samaria to the teaching of the Apostles (Acts viii. 4 ff.), combine to invest the Messianic expectations of the Samaritans with great interest. And this interest is further increased by the fact that Simon Magus, the most influential false teacher of the first age, was himself a native of a village of Samaria (Just. M. *Apol.* i. 26; Clem. *Hom.* ii. 22), and found the readiest acceptance of his prophetic claims among the Samaritans (Acts viii. 9, 10; Just. *l. c.*). Little remains, however, of the scanty Samaritan literature, and that only in an imperfect and altered form (Gesenius, *Anal. Oriental.* i. 1824; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums*, i. 83 ff.). But the same causes which confined the literary activity of an isolated people, tended to preserve their traditions and usages unaltered; and at an early period an attempt was made to derive some clear knowledge of the opinions of the Church from the testimony of its priests. The correspondence was opened by J. C. Scaliger in 1589, and was continued by some English scholars in 1672—1689, by Ludolf, 1685, and by Sylv. de Sacy in the present century. The whole correspondence has been collected and edited by Sylv. de Sacy in an essay in *Notices et extraits des MSS. de la Biblioth. du Roi*, xii. 1 ff. 1831, which still remains the classical authority upon the subject. (Cf. Sylv. de Sacy, *Mémoire sur l'état actuel des Samaritains*, Paris, 1812)

In the English correspondence the doctrine of Messiah — *Hashab* or *Hathab*, *i. e.*, the Converter, at present *El Muhdy*, *i. e.*, the Guide (Robins. ii. 278), in the Samaritan nomenclature — forms a prominent subject. In a letter written to the English in 1672 the Samaritans ask, "What is the name of Hashab who shall appear? and when shall we have consolation, and come from under the hands of the sons of Ishmael?" (Sylv. de Sacy, pp. 181, 191.) In the reply reference is made to Gen. iii. 15; xlix. 10; Deut. xviii. 15; Numb. xxiv. 17. The Samaritans in answer express surprise that no mention is made of Gerizim (p. 209); but they recognize the application of the prophecies, with the exception of Gen. iii. 15; xlix. 10, and speak of the expected Deliverer as "a flaming furnace, and a lamp of fire (Gen. xv. 17), to whom the nations shall be subjected." Our doctors have taught us, they add, that "this prophet will arise, and that all people will be subdued unto Him, and believe on Him, and on the holy law, and on Mount Gerizim; and that the religion of Moses will appear with glory; and that the first name of this prophet who shall rise will be [M.], that he will die and be buried near to Joseph the son of Phorath (*i. e.*, בן פרת, Gen. xlix. 22); and that the tabernacle will be brought to sight by his ministry (which was supposed to be hidden on Mount Gerizim. Cf. Friedrich, *de Christol. Samar.* p. 76), and be established on Mount Gerizim." In the later correspondence with Sylv. de Sacy (1808) it is said: "The doctrine of Hathab, who will come and manifest His spirit, is a great mystery. We shall be happy when He comes. We have prodigies

by which we shall recognize them, and we know His name [Messiah] according to the Rabbis. That which you say of Shiloh is true; he hated the law of Moses" (p. 30). On this last point the Samaritan doctrine is especially worthy of notice. The allusion to Shiloh (Gen. xlix. 10) is not applied to the Messiah, but to an enemy of the Law, perhaps, it is said, to Solomon (p. 29). These particulars, derived from letters, are confirmed in detail by a conversation which Dr. Wilson held with De Sacy's correspondent on the Samaritan Christology, but the conversation furnished no fresh information on the subject (*Lands of the Bible*, ii. 51 ff.).

It must be allowed, however, that beyond the mere general expectation of a deliverer to restore the glory of the Law upon Gerizim, based apparently on Deut. xviii. 15, little else is certainly established by this evidence. The form in which the inquiries were suggested may be supposed in several cases to have modified the answers. On the other hand, nothing can be more arbitrary than the statement of Br. Bauer, who supposes that the Samaritans borrowed the notion of Messiah entirely from the later Jews. Cf. Friedrich, *Discussionum de Christologia Samar. liber*, Lipsiæ, 1821. Gesenius, *de Samar. Theologia*, Halle, 1824.

At present, the miserable remnant of the Samaritans who still occupy a few houses at Nablous appears to be fast hastening to extinction, persecuted and demoralized (Bargès, *Les Samar. de Naplouse*, Paris, 1855. Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth.*, pp. 79 ff. Robinson, *Biblical Researches*, ii. 275 ff.; iii. 129 ff. Ed. 2).

CHAPTER III.

THE ORIGIN OF THE GOSPELS.

Ἡ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων παρακαταθήκη διὰ τῆς γραφῆς λαλοῦσα ὑπουργῷ χρῆται τῷ γράφοντι πρὸς τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἐντευξομένων. — CLEM. ALEX.

The spiritual position of the Apostles incompatible with the design of forming a permanent Christian literature, and yet

A DISTINCT conception of the spirit of the Apostolic age is necessary for a right understanding of the relation of the Gospel to the Gospels — of the divine message to the lasting record — at the rise of Christianity.[1] Experience has placed in so clear a light the fulness and comprehensiveness of the Christian Scriptures, that it is natural to suppose that they must have occupied from the first the position which the Church has assigned to them. But this idea is an anachronism both in fact and in thought. The men who were enabled to penetrate most deeply into the mysteries of the new revelation, and to apprehend with the most vigorous energy the change which it was destined to make in the world, seem to have placed little value upon the written witness

[1] The literature of the subject is so extensive that it would be impossible to give even a general summary of it. Many of the most important essays will be mentioned in the course of the chapter. Those of Gieseler (*Historisch-kritischer Versuch über die Enstehung . . . . der Schriftlichen Evangelien*, Leipzig, 1818) and Ewald (*Jahrbücher*, 1848, ff.) represent with the greatest power the extreme form of the "oral" and "documentary" hypotheses. Thiersch has some good general remarks in his *Versuch zur Herstellung des historischen Standpunkts für die Kritik. d. Neutest. Schrift.* (Erlangen, 1845), and the tract by which it was followed, *Einige Worte über d. Aechth. d. Neutest. Schrift.* (Erlangen, 1846), but with many exaggerations. The object of the present chapter is rather to excite and guide inquiry than to discuss fully the question of the origin of the Gospels in all its bearings — a subject far too vast for the space which can be given to it.

to words and acts which still, as it were, lived among them. They felt as none else ever can feel the greatness of the crisis in which they were placed, and the calm progress of common life appeared to be forever interrupted by the spiritual revolution in which they were called to take part. The "coming age" to which they looked was not one of arduous conflict, but of completed triumph. The close of the old dispensation and the consummation of the new were combined in one vision. The outward "fashion of the world" — the transitory veil which alone remained — was "passing away." The long development of a vast future was concentrated in the glory of its certain issue. But while everything shows that the Apostles made no conscious provision for the requirements of after times, in which the life of the Lord would be the subject of remote tradition, they were enabled to satisfy a want which they did not anticipate. The same circumstances which obscured their view of the immediate future gave to the time in which they lived its true significance. They pierced beneath the temporal and earthly to the spiritual and eternal. Men wrote history as it had never been written, whose present seemed to have no natural sequel, and unfolded doctrine with far-seeing wisdom, while they looked eagerly for that divine presence in which all partial knowledge should be done away. That which was in origin most casual became in effect most permanent by the presence of a divine energy; and the most striking marvel in the scattered writings of the New Testament is the perfect fitness which they exhibit for fulfilling an office of which their authors appear themselves to have had no conception.

favorable to its formation.

The intensity of the hope cherished by the first Christian teachers was not more unfavorable to conscious literary efforts on their part than their original national character. It was most unlikely that men who had been accustomed to a system of training generally, if not exclu-

The national character of the later Palestinian Jews generally alien from literature; and

sively oral, should have formed any design to commit to writing a complete account of the history or of the doctrines of the Gospel. The whole influence of Palestinian habits was most adverse to such an undertaking. The rules of Scriptural interpretation, the varied extensions of the Law, and the sayings of the elders, were preserved either by oral tradition, or perhaps, in some degree, in secret rolls, till the final dispersion of the Jewish nation led to the compilation of the Mishna. Nothing less than the threatened destruction of the traditional faith occasioned the abandonment of the great rule of the schools. "Commit nothing to writing"[1] was the characteristic principle of the earlier Rabbins, and even those who, like Gamaliel, were familiar with Greek learning, faithfully observed it. Nor could it be otherwise. The Old Testament was held to be the single and sufficient source of truth and wisdom, the reflection of divine knowledge, and the embodiment of human feeling. The voice of the teacher might enforce or apply its precepts, but it admitted no definite additions. The various avenues to an independent literature were closed by the engrossing study of the Law; and an elaborate ritualism occupied the place of a popular exposition of its precepts. The learned had no need for writing, and the people had no need for books. The Scriptures contained infinite subjects for meditation in their secret depths; and the practice of Judaism furnished an orthodox commentary upon their general purport, open alike to all, clearly intelligible and absolutely authoritative.

Tradition was dominant in the schools, and from the schools it passed to the nation; for the same influence which affected the character of the teachers must have been felt still more powerfully by the great mass of the Jews. In their case the want of means was added to the want of inclination. In the remoter regions of the north, the impediments to the simplest learning were still greater than

this was more especially the case in Galilee among the peasant class.

[1] Cf. Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums*, i. 367.

those which prevailed at Jerusalem. The school of Tiberias grew up only after the fall of the Temple; and the faithful zeal of the Galilæans may be rightly connected with their intellectual simplicity. To descend one step further: the art of writing itself was necessarily rare among the peasantry, and the instinct of composition proportionately rarer. From all these circumstances, from their nation, their class, their province, their education, the first Christians were primarily unfitted for forming any plan of a comprehensive religious literature. If they were writers, it could only have been by the providential influence of circumstances, while they were oral teachers by inclination and habit.

1. These general obstacles to the conscious formation of a Christian literature were increased by the special work of the Apostles' preaching.

But it may be rightly said, that such obstacles as these are only important when they fall in with others which lie deeper; for men become great writers, even in common life, not so much by discipline as by instinct. In the case of the Apostles, however, these further obstacles were not wanting; their external disinclination for literature was unremoved, if not increased, by their special work. Both from the nature of their charge and the character of their hearers, they sought other means of fulfilling their great commission than such as books afforded. Their Master enjoined on them during His presence, and at the moment of His departure, to "preach the Gospel." And while they fulfilled the office for which they were fitted, no less by habit than by the effusion of the Holy Spirit, they could not have felt that more was needed for the permanent establishment of the Christian society. "How shall men believe without a preacher" (κηρύσσων)? is the truest expression of the feeling and hope of the Apostles. They cherished the lively image of the Lord's life and teaching without any written outline from His hand; and they might well hope that the Spirit which preserved the likeness in their hearts might fix it in the hearts of others. Christianity was contrasted

with Judaism as a dispensation of the Spirit and not of the letter; the laws of which were written not on tables of stone, but on the souls of believers. The sad experience of ages has alone shown the necessity that an unchanging record should coëxist with a living body: in the first generation, the witness of word and the embodiment of the word in practice belonged to the same men.

But this preaching was the true foundation of the Gospels.

It must not, however, be supposed that this tendency to preach rather than to write was any drawback to the final completeness of the Apostolic Gospel. It was, in fact, the very condition and pledge of its completeness. Naturally speaking, the experience of oral teaching was required in order to bring within the reach of writing the vast subject of the Life of Christ; and it cannot be urged that any extraordinary provision was made for the fulfilment of a task which is now rightly felt to have been of the utmost importance. The Gospel was a growth, and not an instantaneous creation. The Gospels[1] were the results, and not the foundation of the Apostolic preaching. Without presuming to decide how far it would have been possible, according to the laws of divine action, to produce in the Apostles an immediate sense of the relation which the history of the Life of Christ occupied towards the future Church, it is evident that the occasion and manner in which they wrote were the results of time and previous labor. The wide growth of the Church furnished them with an adequate motive for adding a written record to the testimony of their living words; and the very form of the Gospels was only determined by the experience of teaching. The work of an Evangelist was thus not the simple result of divine inspiration or of human thought, but rather the complex issue of both when applied to such

1 By the Gospels in this connection I understand the first three "Synoptic" Gospels. The Gospel of St. John stands on a different footing in some respects, as exhibiting the result of the peculiar experience of one Apostle, and not the first and common experience of all.

a selection of Christ's words and works as the varied phases of the Apostolic preaching had shown to be best suited to the wants of men. The primary Gospel was proved, so to speak, in life, before it was fixed in writing. Out of the countless multitude of Christ's acts, those were gathered, in the ministry of twenty years, which were seen to have the fullest representative significance for the exhibition of His divine Life. The oral collection thus formed became in every sense coincident with the "Gospel;" and our Gospels are the permanent compendium of its contents.

Its importance recognized by the Apostles;

This, then, was the first great stage in the Apostles' work — the first step in the composition of the Gospels — to adapt the lessons which they learned with Christ to the requirements of the growing Church. Every detail of their conduct tends to indicate the clearness with which they apprehended the requirements of their office, and fulfilled them by the guidance of the promised Spirit. They remained together at Jerusalem in close communion for a period long enough to shape a common narrative, and to fix it with requisite consistency. They recognized that their message was popular and historic. The place of instruction was the synagogue and the market-place, and not the student's chamber. The qualification for the Apostolate was personal acquaintance with Christ; and St. Paul admitted the condition, and affirmed that he had fulfilled it. Of the great majority of the Apostles, all that we know certainly is, that they were engaged in this first charge of instructing orally the multitudes who were waiting to welcome their tidings. The common work of "the twelve" was *prayer, and the ministry of the word*, though the labors of all are summed up in the acts of two or three. The rest of the Apostles were engaged with St. Peter on the day of Pentecost, and guided by their teaching (διδαχή) the new converts. Signs were wrought by their hands to arrest the attention of their hearers

Acts vi. 4.

Acts ii. 37.

Acts ii. 42.

Acts ii. 43; v. 12.

(τέρατα) and symbolize the purport of their message (σημεῖα) — *the testimony of the resurrection.* The Apostles, in a body, were brought before the council and beaten and forbidden *to speak in the name of Jesus.* And when all others were scattered, they remained steadfastly at Jerusalem, watching the progress of the Church, supplying its wants, and regulating its discipline. *The twelve foundations of the wall of the city of God bore the names of the twelve Apostles.*

Acts iv. 33. *Acts v.* 18, 29, 40. *Acts viii.* 1. *Acts viii.* 14. *Acts xi.* 1. *Acts xv.* 2 *ff.*

Apoc. xxi. 14.

By the Christian fathers;

The earliest fathers saw in this energy of teaching the right fulfilment of the mission of the Apostles. They were likened to the twelve gems upon the robes of the great High Priest, which should give light to the Church.[1] "The elders refrained from writing," it is said, "because they would not interrupt the care which they bestowed in teaching orally by the care of composition, nor expend in writing the time required for the preparation of their addresses." "Perhaps they felt," it is added, "that the functions of the speaker and writer were incompatible; and saw in books only the written confirmation for after time of the instruction which they conveyed at present."[2]

By common language.

Common language bears unequivocal witness to the general prevalence of the same view. Till the end of the first century, and probably till the time of Justin Martyr, the "Gospel" uniformly signifies the substance and not the records of the Life of Christ. The evangelist was not the compiler of a history, but the missionary who carried the good tidings to fresh countries; the bearer, and not the author of the message. Timothy was charged to "fulfil the work of an evangelist;" and evangelists are enumerated by St. Paul with apostles and prophets and teachers among the ministers of the Church.[3]

1 Tertull. *adv. Marc.* iv. 13, p. 229.

2 Clem. Alex. *Eclog. Proph.* § 27, p. 996 P.

3 Eph. iv. 11; 2 Tim. iv. 5. Cf. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 37. Neander, *Pflanz. u. Leit.* i. 205 n.

In the mean time, if any written evidence for the facts of the Gospel were needed, it was found already in the deep words of the prophets. In passing over to Christianity, the Jew did not lay aside his reverence for the Scriptures, but rather seemed to have gained the clew to their meaning which he had before wanted. "All the prophets" spoke of Christ, and to this central subject everything was referred. Nor was this conviction, however difficult it may be for us to apprehend its intensity, partial either in its acceptance or in its action. The same appeals are made to the fulness of the Scriptures in the teaching of St. Paul and of the twelve, before the assemblies of Jews and of Gentiles. The written Gospel of the first period of the Apostolic age was the Old Testament, interpreted by the vivid recollection of the Saviour's ministry. The preaching of the Apostles was the unfolding "of the Law and the prophets."[1]

The Old Testament the written testimony.

Acts iii. 21, 24.

Acts xxviii. 23.

Even in the sub-apostolic age the same general feeling survived, though it was modified by the growing organization of the Christian Church. The knowledge of the teaching of Christ and of the details of His life were generally derived from tradition, and not from writings. The Gospels were not yet distinguished by this, their prophetic title. The Old Testament was still the great storehouse from which the Christian teacher derived the sources of consolation and conviction. And at the close of the second century, Irenæus, after speaking of the Scriptures — the sum of the Apostolic teaching — as "the foundation and pillar of our faith," speaks of a "tradition manifested in the whole world," and "kept in the several churches through the succession of the presbyters."[2]

This conviction lasted practically to the close of the second century.

1 Compare Acts ii. 16, 25, 34; iii. 18, 21, 22, 24; iv. 11; viii. 32 ff.; ix. 22; xiii. 27, 33; xvii. 2, 3; xviii. 28.

2 The substance of this paragraph is wrought out in detail in *The History of the Canon of the N. Testament*, pp. 60 ff.

2. *The Apostolic Gospel was historic. This appears from*

In one respect the testimony of Irenæus — the connecting link of the east and west — is extremely important, as distinctly recognizing the historic element in the Apostolic tradition. The great outlines of the life of Christ were received, he says,[1] by barbarous nations without history (*sine literis*) by ancient tradition; and this combination of facts and doctrine existed from the first. "The Gospel," — the sum, that is, of the oral teaching, — in the language of Ignatius, represents "the flesh (σάρξ) of Jesus."[2] The Saviour's personal presence was perpetuated in the living voice of His Church. At a still earlier time the writings of the New Testament contain abundant proof that the "Gospel" of the first age was not an abstract statement of dogmas, but a vivid representation of the truth, as seen in the details of the Saviour's life. The Acts of the Apostles and the Apostolic letters — the first preaching and the subsequent instruction of the Churches — show that the facts of the life of Christ were the rule by which the work of the Christian teacher was measured.

(a) The description of the Apostolic work.

The first common act of the Apostolic body affirms in the most striking manner the position which they claimed to fill with regard to the Saviour's ministry. Not only was it necessary that the Apostles should be "a witness of the resurrection,"

Acts i. 21, 22.

but the qualification to give this testimony was to be derived from a continuous intercourse with the constant companions of the Lord "from the baptism of John to the Ascension." The Resurrection was the victory which the preacher had to proclaim; but the victory was the issue of a long battle, and found its outward completion in a triumph. Each event in the life of Christ contributed to the final issue; and as the busy prelude of word and work first introduced the closing scenes of suffering and glory, so was it in after times. The ministry of the Saviour was felt to be the necessary prepa-

1 Iren. *c. hær.* iii. 4, 2. 2 Ignat. *ad Phil.* 5.

ration for His Passion. The Apostles could *not but speak the things which they had seen and heard.*[1] The teaching and the acts of Christ were a necessary part of the message of men who were specially charged with the witness to his resurrection.[2]

Acts iv. 20.

The special records of the preaching of the Apostles confirm the impression which is produced by the general description of their office. The Gospel was felt to contain not only a *doctrine* (διδάξαι) but an *announcement* (ἀναγγεῖλαι); and the simplest expression of its contents was "*the testimony of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus*," or, in two words only, "*the Lord Jesus.*" When Philip preached at Samaria he spoke of "*the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ*," of the outward establishment of the Church, and of the personal work of the Saviour; and the same twofold subject was the substance of St. Paul's preaching at Rome, when he "*received for two whole years all that came unto him.*" Nor are examples wanting to show in what way the historic groundwork of the faith was laid. In the two cases in the Acts where the message of Christianity is delivered in detail to those who were waiting for instruction, the great announcement is conveyed by the outline of the ministry of Christ. St. Peter before Cornelius, and St. Paul in the Synagogue at Antioch, sketch shortly the significant traits of the Saviour's life within the very limits which were marked from the first, "the Baptism of John," and the Ascension. There is, however, a difference between the two addresses, which is of considerable moment towards the appreciation of the form in

(b) The records of the Apostolic preaching.

Acts xx. 20.

Acts iv. 33.

Acts xi. 20.

Acts viii. 12.

Acts xxviii. 31.

Acts x. 37—43; *xiii.* 23—31.

[1] In this passage "Peter and *John*" are represented as speaking, and it is impossible not to recall 1 John i. 1—3.

[2] Acts ii. 32; iii. 15; iv. 33; xiii. 31, in which passage St. Paul specially notices the office of the Apostles to witness "to the people."

which the Apostolic teaching was conveyed "*publicly, and from house to house.*" The address of St. Paul was public, and, so to speak, ecclesiastical; that of St. Peter was private and catechetical. The one appears to lead to further inquiry, the other is crowned directly by baptism. The words of St. Peter convey, in fact, a short gospel, and in this, not only the substance but also the evidence of the later creed. He marks the date of Christ's appearance (*after the Baptism which John preached*), the place from which He came, and the inauguration of His work (*how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power*), the point from which His ministry commenced, and the extent to which it spread (*beginning from Galilee . . . . throughout all Judea*), the signs by which His presence was attended, and the different localities in which they were shown (*in the land of the Jews and in Jerusalem*), His crucifixion, His resurrection on the third day, His manifestation to His chosen witnesses, His great charge, His coming to judgment. But while the personal instruction of individuals appears to have embraced the whole ministry of Christ, the public testimony of the Apostles was centred in the facts of the Passion and Resurrection. These form the prominent subjects of the message which they delivered to the general gathering of the Jews and to the council, in the synagogues and before the judgment-seat; and the same cardinal events which are described with the greatest fulness in the written Gospels are noticed with the most minute details in the speeches of the Acts.[1]

Acts xx. 20.

Acts ii. 22 ff.; iii. 13 ff.; iv. 8 ff.; v. 30; xvii. 2, 3; xxvi. 23.

1 The betrayal (Acts ii. 23); the condemnation by the Sanhedrin (xiii. 27); the failure of the charge (xiii. 28); the conduct of Pilate (iii. 13), and of Herod (iv. 27); the choice of Barabbas (iv. 14); the urgency of the people and rulers at Jerusalem (xiii. 27, 28); the crucifixion (iv. 10; v. 30; xi. 39) by Gentile hands (ii. 23); the burial (xiii. 29); the resurrection on the third day (x. 40); the manifestation to chosen witnesses (x. 41) "for many days" (xiii. 31), "who did eat and *drink* with Him after He rose" (x. 41); the charge to the Apostles (x. 42); the ascension to the "right hand of God" (ii. 33; iii. 21).

The letters of the Apostles are the sequel to their preaching, called out in most cases by special circumstances, and dealing rather with the superstructure than with the basis of Christianity. The common groundwork of facts is assumed as lying at the bottom of all reasoning, but as a natural consequence it is not noticed, except by implication or allusion. Christ was set before the eyes of the Galatians as crucified, with the clearness of a vivid picture (*προεγράφη κατ' ὀφθαλμούς*). The "Gospel" which St. Paul proclaimed to the Corinthians was the story of the death and resurrection of Christ. In speaking to the Thessalonians it is evident that he had dwelt upon the great issue of the Resurrection, the second coming of the Lord. And everything tends to show that "the traditions"[1] which formed an important part of the Apostolic teaching included the details of the Lord's ministry, which were committed to the Evangelist as the rule of his work. But the Epistles themselves were not designed for primary instruction, but for the further instruction of those who were familiar with the great outlines of the "revelation of godliness" which were embodied in the baptismal confession. This confession, however, was the standard of Christian thought; and in spite of the character which was necessitated by their destination, the Epistles contain in scattered notices a fairly complete sketch of the life of Christ, such as might be

(c) The contents of the Apostolic letters.

Gal. iii. 1.

1 Cor. xv. 1–4.

1 Tim. iii. 16.

1 This follows from the usage of the correlative words *παραδιδόναι παράδοσις, παραλαμβάνειν.* Luke i. 2, *καθὼς παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται . . . .* (the events of the ministry of Christ.). 1 Cor. xi. 23. *Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ* (not *παρά*) *τοῦ Κυρίου ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν . . . .* (the details of the Last Supper). 1 Cor. xv. 3, *παρέδωκα . . . . ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον* (the details of the Passion and Resurrection). These unequivocal examples of a historical tradition illustrate the other passages in which the words are used in a more general sense: Rom. vi. 17, *εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς.* 1 Cor. xi. 2; *Jud.* 3, *τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει*; 2 Thess. ii. 15; (iii. 6); Gal. i. 9; 1 Thess. ii. 13. Compare also *παρακαταθήκη, παραθήκη*, 1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 12, 14, with Clem. *Ecl. Proph.* § 27, *ἡ γὰρ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων παρακαταθήκη διὰ τῆς γραφῆς λαλοῦσα ὑπουργῷ χρῆται τῷ γράφοντι πρὸς τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἐντευξομένων.*

gathered from the letters of a missionary of the present day thoroughly familiar with the substance of the Gospels.

i. St. James and St. Jude.

The Epistles of St. James and St. Jude are in this respect distinguished from the other Apostolic writings, for, with the exception of the allusions to the "presence" of the "Lord Jesus Christ," they contain no allusions to the details of His work.[1] But even thus they bear indirect testimony to the existence of a traditional Gospel. The language of St. James offers the most striking coincidences with the language of our Lord's discourses;[2] and St. Jude speaks of "the most holy faith," the basis of the Christian life, not as a simple principle, but as a sum of facts.[3]

ii. St. Peter, 1st Epistle.

The first Epistle of St. Peter bears in every chapter the vivid image of Christ's sufferings (i. 21; ii. 21 ff; iii. 18; iv. 1, 13; v. 1). It seems as if the Apostle delighted to turn back with penitent and faithful gaze to the scene of his own fall and his Master's love, as he pictures Him silent and uncomplaining before His accusers, and bears witness to others of what he had himself seen (v. 1). But St. Peter does not confine his allusions to the humiliation of Christ, to His rejection (ii. 4, 7, 8), His crucifixion (ii. 24), His death (i. 2, 19): he speaks of His eternal election (i. 20), and records with confident hope His resurrection (i. 3, 21; iii. 21) and exaltation to the right hand of God (iii. 22; cf. i. 21). The scenes of suffering are connected with corresponding scenes of glory (i. 11, αἱ μετὰ ταῦτα δόξαι); and while the Apostles allude with apparent distinctness to the last charge of Christ (v. 2, 3) and the descent of the Holy Spirit (i. 12), he looks forward to the glorious coming of the great Judge as the consummation of His work (i. 5, 7, 13; iv. 5).

The second Epistle is chiefly remarkable for the detailed

1 James v. 8; Jude 24.

2 James i. 5, 6 || Matt. vii. 7; xxi. 22; James i. 22 || Matt. vii. 21; James ii. 13 || Matt. v. 7; James iii. 1 || Matt. xxiii. 8; James iii. 12 || Matt. vii. 16. Cf. Credner *Einl.* § 321, p. 608. In James v. 12 || Matt. v. 36, 37, there is a coincidence with the Clementine reading (*Hom.* iii. 55; xix. 2).

3 Jude 20.

reference to the Transfiguration (i. 16 ff.), which, in the midst of marked peculiarities of language, offers a most interesting parallel to the evangelic narrative. The words of the heavenly voice are to a great extent coincident with those recorded by St. Matthew, with the natural omission of the last clause;[1] but the comparative elaborateness of the description seems to offer an instructive contrast to the simplicity of the earlier Gospel.[2]

2nd Epistle.

St. Paul says, in writing to the Corinthians, that his single determination was to proclaim to them Christ crucified; and the "cross of Christ" is the centre and sign of his Epistles. The phrase, "*the cross*" (1 Cor. i. 18; Gal. v. 11), '*the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ*" (Gal. vi. 14), "*the cross of Christ*" (1 Cor. i. 17; Gal. vi. 12; Phil. iii. 18), is peculiar to his writings, for the single additional passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. xii. 2, *a cross of shame*) is purely historic, and it cannot but appear characteristic of the view which he took of the Christian faith.[3] In various places he marks the supreme judge (1 Tim. vi. 13 *under Pontius Pilate*[4]), the time (1 Cor. v. 7, *Christ our Passover is slain*), the instruments (1 Thess. ii. 15, *the Jews who killed the Lord Jesus*) of the Lord's death. But the death of Christ was, as it were, only the way to the resurrection; and in the writings of St. Paul the two events are put forward as forming the very substance of "the Gospel" (1 Cor. xv. 1 ff.),[5] and as such are constantly combined

iii. St. Paul.
1 *Cor. ii.* 2.

1 The reading *εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησα* for *ἐν ᾧ εὐδ.* (which some good MSS. read) is found also in *Hom. Clem.* iii. 53.

The recurrence of the word *ἔξοδος* in a metaphorical sense is remarkable in 2 Pet. i. 15 || Luke ix. 31.

2 *e. g. φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης — ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ ἁγίῳ.*

3 In connection with this it may be observed that the metaphorical sense of *σταυρόω* (Gal. v. 24; vi. 14) is peculiar to St. Paul.

4 The mention of Pontius Pilate is remarkable, according to the common translation, as the reference in that case must be rather to the event of John xviii. 36 ff. than of Matt. xxvii. 11. It is better, however, to take *ἐπί*, as in the Creed, simply as marking the date.

5 It is very important to notice

(Rom. iv. 24, 25; xiv. 9). Yet even thus the completeness of the narrative is preserved. "Christ died . . . . . and *was buried* . . . . . and rose again *on the third day*" (1 Cor. xv. 4 ff.). Afterwards the reality of the resurrection is attested by the subsequent appearances to Cephas, to the twelve, to above five hundred brethren, to James, to all the Apostles, to St. Paul himself (1 Cor. xv. 5—8). In several places the Apostle assumes the fact of the Ascension (Rom viii. 24; Eph. i. 20; Col. iii. 1), and in one phrase he clearly alludes to it (1 Tim. iii. 16, *ἀνελήφθη*. Cf. Mark xvi. 19; Acts i. 2).

In respect to the prominence thus given to the last scenes of our Lord's life, the Epistles of St. Paul are in harmony with the narrative of the Gospels. It was felt that the whole life of Christ was outwardly summed up in its crowning issue, in the depth of shame and in the fulness of triumph; but the preparation is not unnoticed by St. Paul. At the first, "*Christ made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant*" (Phil. ii. 5 ff.), "*being rich, for our sakes He became poor*" (2 Cor. viii. 9), "*born of a woman*" (Gal. iv. 4), sprung from the Jews "*according to the flesh*" (Rom. ix. 5), "*the seed of Abraham*" (Gal. iii. 16), "*of the seed of David*" (Rom. i. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 8), brought in subjection to the law (Gal. iv. 4, *ὑπὸ νόμον*), circumcised (Col. ii. 11), associated with others as His brethren (Gal. i. 19). In His life "*He pleased not Himself*" (Rom. xv. 3), but left an image of "*meekness and gentleness*" (2 Cor. x. 1) in the midst of afflictions (Col. i. 24; 2 Cor. vi. 5; 1 Thess. i. 6); and the pattern of the life of Christ is that to which the Christian must aspire, and to which he will at last attain (Eph. iv. 13). One scene only, the institution of the Last Supper, is described

that St. Paul speaks of this Gospel as "handed down" (xv. 1, 3). He first received (*παρέλαβε*) and in turn transmitted (*παρέδωκε*) the Gospel. In the same way he speaks of "receiving (mediately) from the Lord" (*παρελ. ἀπὸ τοῦ* K. not *παρὰ τοῦ* K.) the account of the institution of the Eucharist (1 Cor. xi. 23). Cf. Neander, *Gesch. d. Pflanz. u. s. w.* i. 130 ff. Supr. p. 185, n. 1.

in detail, and in that the language is almost coincident with that of the narrative in the Gospels (1 Cor. x. 16; xi. 23—26).[1]

The Epistle to the Hebrews.

The Epistle to the Hebrews touches on each of the great features in the Saviour's life, as His incarnation (ii. 9 ff.), His descent from Judah (vii. 14), His temptation (ii. 18; iv. 15), His consecration to His ministry (v. 5), His humiliation (ii. 9 ff.) and sufferings (v. 8), His agony (v. 7, with peculiar details), and crucifixion (vi. 6) outside the walls (xiii. 12), and His exaltation to the right hand of God (viii. 1; ix. 24 ff.).[2]

iv. St. John.

The references which St. John makes in his epistles to the circumstances of the life of Christ are exactly accordant with the character of his Gospel. He dwells on the preëxistence of the Son of God (iv. 9), and, at the same time, affirms with the most complete distinctness His real incarnation (iv. 2), and bodily presence (i. 1, αἱ χεῖρες ἡμ. ἐψηλάφησαν), and death (i. 7; ii. 2). In the same way, without noticing the resurrection expressly, he speaks of the mediatorial work of Christ in the presence of the Father (ii. 1), and His future "coming in the flesh" (2 Ep. 7, ἐρχόμενον). The beginning and close of the Lord's ministry, His baptism and death, are shown to be mysteriously united, inwardly in the completion of a divine testimony, and outwardly in one of the last incidents of the Passion (v. 6). In St. John the spiritual significance is extended over the literal, but a foundation of historic details lies at the foundation of the higher lesson.

The substance of the Gospels recognized generally in the Epistles.

The connection of the Evangelic narrative with the Apostolic Epistles is not, however, confined to mere allusions. The spirit and tone of the letters presuppose some such record as

1 If the text of Luke xxii. 19, 20, be correct, the coincidence is verbal, but the confusion which exists in these verses renders it more than probable that an interpolation has been made from 1 Cor. xi. 23 ff.

2 Cf. Stanley, *Ep. to Corinthians*, pp. 586 ff. 2 Ed.

that which is contained in the histories. The substance of the Gospels is an adequate explanation of the form of the first Christian teaching, and it is impossible to conceive of any other. If it be true that scarcely any clear references to the recorded discourses of the Lord are contained in the Epistles, for the parallels to 1 Cor. vii. 10 (Matt. v. 32) and 1 Cor. ix. 14 (Luke x. 4, 7, cf. 1 Tim. v. 18) are at best uncertain, it is no less true that the life and words of Christ are everywhere assumed as the basis of all doctrine. He is Himself wisdom (1 Cor. i. 30), the centre of truth (Eph. iv. 21), "the true" (1 John v. 20); His commandments are absolute (1 Cor. xiv. 27); His words are the decisive rule of "sound" doctrine (1 Tim. vi. 3); His example the one perfect model (1 Pet. ii. 21; Phil. ii. 5; 1 John ii. 6). It is everywhere assumed that the Christian is familiar with the portraiture of his Master, and each of the traits which are preserved in these passing notices is seen in its full expression in the Gospels. The New Testament, as a whole, is a key to the sub-apostolic history; the Gospels, not perhaps in their written but in their oral form, are the key to the Epistles.[1]

Summary.

Thus far, then, it has been shown that the characteristic work of the Apostles was preaching, and not writing; that they were inclined to this form of teaching by character and training, no less than by their special commission; that the first "Gospel" was consequently an oral message, and not a written record; that the books of the Old Testament were the sufficient Apostolic Scriptures (cf. 2 Tim. iii. 15). It has been further shown that this oral Gospel of the Apostles was

1 It is remarkable that there is (as far as I know) no direct allusion to the miracles of our Lord in the Epistles; but it is possible (Stanley, l. c.) that the word *δαιμόνια* in 1 Cor. x. 20, 21, which occurs elsewhere in St. Paul only in 1 Tim. iv. 1, may be chosen with a distinct reference to the antagonism so often brought out in the Lord's life in His "casting out devils." It is a similar fact, that in the writings of the apostolic fathers there are (I believe) no allusions to the miracles of the Apostles. The omission in both cases arises from the nature of the writings.

historic; that the Apostles were expressly declared to be witnesses of the whole ministry of Christ; that their preaching rested on the details of His life; that their letters presuppose an acquaintance with the facts of the Gospel, and preserve such an outline of its contents as is filled up in our Gospels. It remains still to inquire whether there is any direct evidence for connecting our present Gospels with the oral cycle of evangelic facts which is thus seen to have existed; and whether the theory of a common oral origin is consistent with the peculiarities of form which they exhibit.

II. The written Gospels.

1. Distinctly connected with the Apostolic preaching.

On the first point early testimony is explicit and uniform. Each of the first three Gospels is distinctly connected by adequate evidence with the previous preaching of Apostles, as being intended to supply a permanent record of that which was before only traditional. The written Gospels are acknowledged in history to be the last stage of the Apostolic preaching, the preparation for the passage into a new age.

(a) St. Mark; on the evidence of Papias; and

The earliest account of the origin of a "Gospel" is that which Papias has given on the authority of the elder John.[1] Papias was himself a "direct hearer" of this John, and John was "a disciple of the Lord," if the text of Papias be correct, and, at any rate, contemporary with the later period of the Apostolic age. "This also, then, was the statement of the elder. Mark having become Peter's interpreter, wrote accurately all that he (Peter) mentioned (ἐμνημόνευσε);[2]

1 Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39. Routh, *Rell. Sacr.* i. pp. 13 ff.

2 This word is ambiguous, like ἀπεμνημόνευσε below, and may mean "*remembered*," or "*mentioned*." It is used in both senses in the chapter of Eusebius in which the quotation occurs. The first sense is that in which it is commonly taken here, but after further consideration I am inclined now to prefer the second rendering as more consistent with the other forms in which the tradition is preserved. A passage of Eusebius (*Dem. Ev.* iii. 5), however, seems to favor the other rendering in the second case: Πέτρος οὐδὲ καθῆκεν ἐπὶ τὴν εὐαγγελίου γραφὴν δι' εὐλαβείας ὑπεροχήν· τούτου Μάρκος γνώριμος καὶ φοιτητὴς γεγονὼς ἀπομνημονεῦσαι λέγεται τὰς τοῦ Πέτρου

though he did not [record] in order that which was either said or done by Christ (*οὐ μέντοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα*). For he neither heard the Lord nor followed (*παρηκολούθησεν*) Him; but subsequently, as I said [attached himself to] Peter, who used to frame his teaching to meet the wants [of his hearers], but not as making a connected narrative of the Lord's discourses (*ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν Κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγων*. All. *λογίων*). So Mark committed no error, as he wrote down some particulars (*ἔνια γράψας*) as he narrated them (*ἀπεμνημόνευσεν*); for he took heed to one thing, to omit nothing of things he heard, and to make no false statement in [his account of] them."

This most important testimony notices the three points on which stress has been already laid, the historic character of the oral Gospel, the special purpose with which it was framed, the fragmentariness of its contents; and it was on such an oral basis that our present Gospel of St. Mark is said to have been founded, according to the evidence of one who must have known the Apostles.

later writers.

Later writers, partly as it seems from an independent tradition, and partly from this statement of Papias, repeat the same general statement of the relation of St. Mark to St. Peter with various differences of detail. Irenæus defines more exactly the time of the publication of the Gospel, though the reading is uncertain. "After the decease (*ἔξοδον*, cf. 2 Pet. i. 15) of these (Peter and Paul), Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, himself also handed down to us in writing the things which were preached by Peter."[1] Clement of Alexandria records, as "a tradition of the elders of former

περὶ τῶν πράξεων τοῦ Ἰησοῦ διαλέξεις . . . . πάντα γὰρ τὰ παρὰ Μάρκῳ τοῦ Πέτρου διαλέξεων εἶναι λέγεται ἀπομνημονεύματα. Comp. also Clem. Alex. *ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14. . . . . *τὸν Μάρκον μεμνημένον τῶν λεχθέντων ἀναγράψαι τὰ εἰρημένα.* . . . .

[1] Iren. *adv. Hær.* iii. 1. Cf. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 8. The reading, *μετὰ τὴν τούτου* (sc. *τοῦ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγελίου*) *ἔκδοσιν* (Cramer, *Cat. in Marc.* p. 264) is worthy of notice, as the date is not consistent with the other accounts. Elsewhere Irenæus calls Mark *interpres et sectator* (*i. e. ἀκόλουθος*) *Petri* (iii. 10, 6).

time" (παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνέκαθεν πρεσβυτέρων), an account, which, though very similar to that of Papias, appears to be distinct from it. "[It is said] that when Peter had publicly preached (κηρύξαντος) the word in Rome, and declared the Gospel by inspiration (πνεύματι ἐξειπόντος τὸν λόγον), those who were present, being many, urged Mark, as one who had followed him from a distant time, and remembered what he said, to record (ἀναγράψαι) what he stated (τὰ εἰρημένα); and that he, having made his Gospel, gave it to those who requested him; and that Peter, when he was aware of this, took pains neither to hinder him nor to encourage him in the work (προτρεπτικῶς μήτε κωλῦσαι μήτε προτρέψασθαι)."[1] Origen says still more expressly that "Mark made his Gospel as Peter guided him (ὑφηγήσατο)."[2] Tertullian, in like manner, remarks that "the Gospel of Mark is maintained to be Peter's, whose interpreter he was, ... for it is possible that that which scholars publish should be regarded as their master's work."[3]

The tradition was repeated in later times, but generally in the later form which Eusebius gave to it, according to which St. Peter expressly "sanctioned the writing [of Mark] for the use of the Church," in accordance with a divine revelation; a statement which is at direct variance with the authority which Eusebius quotes, and internally improbable.[4]

1 Clem. Alex. *Fragm. Hypotyp.* p. 1016 P. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14. So also *Adumbr. in Pet. Ep.* I. p. 1007; Marcus Petri sectator palam prædicente Petro evangelium Romæ coram quibusdam Cæsareanis equitibus et multa Christi testimonia proferente, penitus ut possent quæ dicebantur memoriæ commendari, scripsit ex his quæ Petro dicta sunt evangelium quod secundum Marcum vocitatur.

The false references which Eusebius (*H. E.* ii. 15) and Jerome (*de virr. illustr.* 8) make to this passage, as though St. Peter did confirm the Gospel by special revelation, are evidently later embellishments of the tradition.

2 *Comm. in Matt.* i. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25.

3 *Contr. Marc.* iv. 5.

To these writers Justin M. may be added, who speaks of "the memoirs (ἀπομνημονεύματα) of Peter" with an obvious reference to St. Mark; *Dial.* c. 106. *Hist. of N. T. Canon*, pp. 130 f.

4 The later writers are quoted by Credner, *Einl.* p. 113 ff.

In another place Eusebius (*H. E.* ii. 16) represents St. Mark as "preaching himself in Egypt the Gospel which he composed."

(b) St. Matthew.

The history of the present Gospel of St. Matthew is beset with peculiar difficulties, and the earliest writers are silent as to the circumstances which attended its composition. While using the Greek text as unquestionably authentic, they recognize unanimously the existence of a Hebrew archetype, of which they seem to regard the canonical book as an authoritative translation or representative, but still without offering any explanation of the manner in which this substitution was made. Papias, probably on the testimony of the elder John, though this is not clear, states simply that "Matthew composed the oracles in the Hebrew language; but each interpreted them as he could."[1] This evidence then carries us back to a time when no Greek Gospel bearing the name of St. Matthew was generally current, though a Hebrew Gospel,—for λόγια, "oracles," can mean no less,—of which he was the author, was known and used. In the next generation the Greek Gospel was used most commonly by Justin, though he is silent as to the authorship;[2] and in the time of Clement of Alexandria,[3] Tertullian[4] and Irenæus,[5] the present Gospel was recognized by the Church as the authentic work of St. Matthew. But the reception of the Greek text did not interfere with the earlier belief. The existence of a Hebrew original is confirmed by the statements of Irenæus[6] and Origen,[7] on the authority of "tradition" (ὡς ἐν παραδόσει μαθών), and by the general consent of later opinion, as well as by the story of Pantænus, who is said to have found in "India" "the Hebrew

1 Papias *ap.* Eusebius, *H. E.* iii. 39. Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο, ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἠδύνατο ἕκαστος. The form of the sentence is remarkable, and the aorist marks a change before Papias' (or John's) time. Cf. *Hist. of N. T. Canon*, 79.

2 Cf. *Hist. of N. T. Canon*, pp. 154 ff.

3 Clem. Alex. *Hypotyp.* l. c. Cf. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14.

4 Tert. *c. Marc.* iv. 2 . . . fidem ex apostolis Joannes et Matthæus insinuant.

5 Iren. *adv. Hær.* iii. 11, 8 . . . ὁ Λόγος . . . ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τετράμορφον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἑνὶ δὲ πνεύματι συνεχόμενον.

6 Iren. *adv. Hær.* iii. 1. Cf. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 8.

7 Orig. *Comm. in Matt.* i. Cf. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25.

writing of Matthew," which was left there by the Apostle Bartholomew.[1] But none of these writers allude to the origin of the Gospel. This is first described by Eusebius, in a passage which bears strong internal marks of probability, though it is impossible to point out the authorities on which it rests. "Matthew," he says, "having formerly preached to Hebrews, when he was about to go to others also, having committed to writing in his native tongue the Gospel according to him, filled up by his writing what was wanting in his presence (*τὸ λεῖπον τῇ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ, i. e.*, the loss they felt as he was no longer with them) to those from whom he set out."[2] This may be a mere conjecture by which Eusebius explains the earlier tradition, but in the absence of all opposing evidence it must be allowed to have some weight.

(c) St. Luke.

The early accounts of the origin of the Gospel of St. Luke were strictly parallel to those of the origin of St. Mark, but less detailed. "Luke, the follower of Paul," says Irenæus,[3] "set down in a book the Gospel which he (Paul) used to preach (*τὸ ὑπ' ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγ.*)." Tertullian speaks of St. Paul as "the *illuminator* of Luke," and says that "the summary (digestum) of Luke was generally assigned to Paul."[4] The allusions which St. Paul makes to "his Gospel" (Rom. ii. 16; xvi. 25; 2 Tim. ii. 8. Cf. 2 Cor. viii. 18) and to St. Luke, soon gave occasion to suppose that he himself used the Gospel of St. Luke. Even Origen speaks of "the Gospel of Luke as that praised by Paul;"[5] and the tradition assumed a more definite shape in the writings of Jerome[6] and the Pseudo-Athanasius. It is remarkable, however, that Eusebius refers to the conjecture (*φασι*)

1 Euseb. *H. E.* v. 10. Cf. Hieron. *de virr. illustr.* 36.

2 Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 24.

3 Iren. *adv. Hær.* iii. 1. 1. Cf. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 8. Elsewhere Irenæus calls Luke "inseparabilis a Paulo et coöperarius ejus in evangelio" (*adv. Hær.* iii. 14, 1) .... qui semper cum Paulo prædicavit .... et cum eo evangelizavit et creditus est nobis referre evangelium. (l. c.).

4 Tert. *adv. Marc.* iv. 2; iv. 5.

5 Orig. *ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25.

6 Hieron. *de virr. illustr.* 7.

without trace of approval, though the corresponding tradition, which confers the direct authority of St. Peter on the Gospel of St. Mark, rests on his authority.[1]

The evidence of St. Luke's Preface. (Luke i. 1—4.)

But, apart from tradition, the preface with which St. Luke opens his Gospel throws a striking light upon its composition. The words have been made the subject of the most varied controversy, though the true sense seems to lie upon their surface. Both in the description which he gives of other "Gospels," and in the peculiar character which he claims for his own, St. Luke appears to confirm the views already given of the prevalence and nature of the unwritten Gospel of the first age. The common basis of the Evangelic narratives is said to be the oral "tradition of those who from the beginning (cf. Acts i. 21, 22) were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word." The two elements in the Apostolic character which have been already pointed out, personal knowledge (αὐτόπται) and practical experience (ὑπηρέται), are recognized by St. Luke as present in those who originally "handed down" (παρέδοσαν) the history which many attempted to draw up and arrange afresh (ἀνατάξασθαι) in a connected shape (ἀναγ. διήγησιν . . . καθὼς π.). The work of these first unknown Evangelists was new only in form, and not in substance. The tradition which they incorporated in a narrative was not peculiar to themselves, but common to all (καθ. παρ. ἡμῖν);[2] for the common belief was independent of these written records. St. Luke speaks of the "attempts" as of something which had no influence at the present.[3] The "facts" were "fully believed" (πεπληροφορημένων, not πληροφορηθέντων, Rom. iv. 21) apart from the evidence of such documents. Theophi-

1 Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 4.

2 Bp. Marsh justly insists on the importance of the phrase: *The origin of the first three Gospels*, p. 364.

3 Ἐπεχείρησαν, "attempted," *not* "have attempted." Possibly some feeling of this difference influenced Origen's judgment, when he saw in the word "attempt" itself a reproof of unauthorized temerity (*Hom. in Luc.* 1.).

lus was already "instructed" in "the words"[1] of the exact truth of which St. Luke wished to assure him; and his instruction was derived not from books, but from that oral teaching (κατηχήθης), which is described by the same term from the first foundation of the Church (Acts xviii. 25; Gal. vi. 6). So far, then, the statements of St. Luke corroborate in the fullest manner the view which has been taken of the origin of written Gospels. The narrative was the embodiment of the oral accounts; the "facts" (πράγματα) were coördinate with "the word;" the work of the Evangelist was arrangement rather than fresh composition; the subjects with which he dealt were at once matters of firm conviction and ordinary instruction. The grounds on which St. Luke rests his own narrative involve the same principles. It is evident at first that he represents his Gospel as a faithful embodiment of the "Evangelic tradition." He finds no fault with the basis on which the earlier writers rested. His own determination is placed on an equal footing with theirs (ἔδοξε κἀμοί); but he claims for himself a knowledge of the Apostolic preaching continuous from the first, complete, exact, and for his writing a due order (Luke i. 3, παρηκολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι). Each word in the sentence contributes an important element to the completeness of the whole idea. St. Luke appears to speak of a gradual unfolding of the whole Gospel in the course of the Apostolic work which he had watched from the first step throughout in every detail. The same term (παρακολουθεῖν) describes the personal attendance on a teacher (Papias, l. c. ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39), and the careful following of a doctrine (1 Tim. iv. 6; 2 Tim. iii. 10). The long companionship seems to be the criterion of the complete knowledge. And this view of the notion implied in "following" illustrates the meaning of the next words. St. Luke's "continuous

1 "The words" (οἱ λόγοι) being the constituent elements of "the word" (ὁ λόγος). Cf. 1 Tim. iv. 6.

familiarity" with the subject gave him a knowledge of the whole cycle of the "tradition," and not only of particular periods or of particular parts of it. His knowledge started from the first, and extended to every point; and the peculiar advantages of the Evangelist are enforced by the notice of his special care (ἀκριβῶς) and plan. But the notion of order (καθεξῆς) does not necessarily involve that of time, but rather that of moral or logical sequence (cf. Acts xi. 4). The two may coincide, and in the exhibition of a perfect life they will in the main, but chronology is not paramount in the Gospels, and the language of St. Luke does not imply that he designed to follow it. Like the teaching on which it was first based, the record is subservient to special requirements. It is complete in regard to its object, but not absolutely; a message of good tidings, and not a biography; united in its several parts by a spiritual law, and not by a table of dates.

2. The internal character of the Gospels.

Hitherto all the evidence which can be gathered from the circumstances of the early Church, and the traditions of the origin of the Gospels, has tended to establish the existence of an original oral Gospel, definite in general outline and even in language, which was committed to writing in the lapse of time in various special shapes, according to the typical forms which it assumed in the preaching of different Apostles. It is probable that this oral Gospel existed from the first in Aramaic and Greek, as would naturally be the case in a country where two languages were generally current. The teaching of St. Matthew "among his own countrymen" is expressly said to have been in "Hebrew," and it is not less certain that Greek must have been the common medium of intercourse with the Hellenists. The step from these oral narratives to written records in Hebrew and Greek is simple and natural; but nothing has been said yet of the internal evidence to be derived from the Gospels themselves; and still it is on this that the decision of the question of their origin mainly

depends. General indications and beliefs, probabilities and seeming coincidences, must be abandoned if they are clearly opposed to the internal character of the books — to the peculiarities of their mutual relations, to the extent and limit of their similarity and difference, to the general unity by which they are held together, and to the special characteristics by which they are distinguished. It may be asked whether there is any intimate external connection between the Gospels? Whether the resemblances which exist point to the existence of a common source or to mutual dependence? Whether, in the latter case, it is possible to determine the order of precedence, or in the former the nature — oral or written — of the original records? Various answers have been given to these questions, but the first, at least, may be regarded as definitely settled. No one at present would maintain, with some of the older scholars of the Reformation, that the coincidences between the Gospels are due simply to the direct and independent action of the same Spirit upon the several writers. The explanation of the phenomena which they present is sought by universal consent in the presence of a common element, though opinions are still divided as to its nature. The original source of the resemblance may lie in the influence of an original tradition, or of a popular narrative, or in the earliest written Gospel itself; but the existence of some such source is admitted on all sides. The merits of the different hypotheses must be decided by their fitness to satisfy the various conditions of the question; and before attempting to decide their claims, it will be necessary to gain a distinct notion of the nature and extent of the concordances of which an explanation is required.[1]

(a) The nature of the problem which they present.

1 For the study of the parallelisms of the Gospels abundant helps are provided. Greswell's *Harmonia Evangelica* (Ed. 4ta. Oxon., 1845) is perfect in respect of typography, but the text is bad and altogether unprovided with critical apparatus, so that it cannot be safely used alone. Stroud's *New Greek Harmony* (Lond., 1853) is second only to Greswell in the convenience of its

The concordances of the synoptic Gospels may be classed under three heads: — general agreement in the plan and arrangement of the materials; constant identity of narrative in form and substance; and verbal coincidences. With these concordances are combined differences in detail and expression, large interpolations of peculiar matter, distinct revisions, so to speak, of the same record, so that the points of meeting between the different writers are scarcely more numerous than the points of divergence, and the theory which explains the existence of the former must not leave the existence of the latter unnoticed or unexplained.

i. The concordances between them threefold.

The general plan of the first three Gospels exhibits a remarkable correspondence. The history of the Infancy contained in St. Matthew and St. Luke finds no parallel in St. Mark, but afterwards the main course of the three narratives is throughout coincident. The preparation for the Ministry, John the Baptist, the Baptism, the Temptation, the return to Galilee, the preaching in Galilee, the journey to Jerusalem, the entrance into Jerusalem and the preaching there, the Passion, the Resurrection — such is the common outline which they all present, and the same relative order of the subordinate incidents is always preserved by St. Mark and St. Luke, and also by St. Matthew, with the exception of some of the earlier sections. The most remarkable differences lie in the presence of a long series of events connected with the Galilæan ministry, which are peculiar to St. Matthew and St. Mark,[1] and a second series of events connected with the journey to Jerusalem, which is peculiar to St. Luke.[2]

a. In general plan.

typographical arrangement, and it has a fair *apparatus criticus*. Anger's *Synopsis Evangeliorum Matt. Marc. Luc.* . . . . (Lipsiæ, 1851) contains a most complete and elaborate summary of all the early evangelic fragments and quotations in addition to the canonical text and critical apparatus, but the arrangement is not so distinct as that in Greswell and Stroud. For practical purposes, Anger, combined with Stroud or Greswell, will furnish all the student can require.

1 Matt. xiv. 22—xvi. 12.=Mark vi. 45—viii. 26.

2 Luke ix. 51—xviii. 14.

Nor is the obvious similarity of the synoptic Gospels confined to their broad outlines. The incidents with which their outlines are filled up are often identical and always similar. The absolute extent of this coincidence of incident admits of a simple representation by numbers; and though the relations which are given are only approximately true, they convey a clearer notion of the nature of the phenomenon than any general description. The proportion may be exhibited in several modes, and each method places the truth in a new light.

b. In incident.

If the total contents of the several Gospels be represented by 100, the following table is obtained:[1]

	Peculiarities.	Concordances.
St. Mark,	7	93
St. Matthew,	42	58
St. Luke,	59	41
[St. John,	92	8]

From this it appears that the several Gospels bear almost exactly an inverse relation to one another, St. Mark and St. John occupying the extreme positions, the proportion of original passages in one balancing the coincident passages in the other. If again the extent of all the coincidences be represented by 100, their proportionate distribution will be:[2]

St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke,	53
St. Matthew, St. Luke,	21
St. Matthew, St. Mark,	20
St. Mark, St. Luke,	6

Or, if we follow another principle of comparison, and take the whole number of distinct *sections* in the synoptic Evangelists as 150 approximately, the peculiarities and concordances of the Gospels may be thus exhibited:

1 Stroud, *Harmony of the Gospels*, p. 117.

2 Compare Norton's *Genuineness of the Gospels*, i. 373 ff.

	Peculiarities.		Concordances.	
St. Luke, . . .	37	65	12	5
St. Matthew, . .	14		15	
St. Mark, . . .	2			
	53			97

The relations thus obtained harmonize on the whole with the former, but it appears that in regard to their mutual connections the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark have a much greater similarity of subject, and those of St. Matthew and St. Luke a somewhat greater similarity in the mere extent of coincidence, than conversely. Other interesting combinations might be obtained from an examination of the range of greatest coincidence and most distinctive peculiarities; but, looking only at the general result, it may be said that of the contents of the synoptic Gospels about two-fifths are common to the three, and that the parts peculiar to one or other of them are little more than one-third of the whole. In St. Mark there are not more than four and twenty verses to which parallels do not exist in St. Matthew or St. Luke, though St. Mark exhibits everywhere traits of vivid detail, which are peculiar to his narrative.

c. In language.

It is not, however, enough to consider general coincidences of substance and subject. Such a view conveys a false and exaggerated idea of the likeness between the Gospels. In spite of their general resemblance they are severally distinct in style and effect. The identity of range is combined with difference of treatment, peculiarities of language with unity of scope. The *verbal* coincidences between the different Gospels, while in themselves sufficiently remarkable, are yet considerably less than might appear from the popular statement of the facts. The passages common to St. Matthew and some other of the Synoptic Gospels form a little more than four-sevenths of the whole, but the corresponding verbal coincidences are less than one-sixth. In the other Gospels the proportion of verbal coincidences is still less. Those in

St. Luke form about one-tenth, and in St. Mark about one-sixth of the whole Gospels, while the general coincidences form respectively about two-fifths and thirteen-fourteenths.[1] Thus the approximate relation between the general and verbal coincidences of the Gospels may be represented tabularly:

St. Matthew.	St. Luke.	St. Mark.
24 : 7	4 : 1	39 : 7
	28 : 7	

The distribution of verbal coincidences peculiar.

Nor is this all: in the distribution of the verbal coincidences a very simple law is observable. They occur most commonly in the recital of the words of our Lord or of others, and are comparatively rare in the simple narrative. Thus, of the verbal coincidences in St. Matthew about seven-eighths, of those in St. Mark about four-fifths, and of those in St. Luke about nineteen-twentieths occur in the record of the words of others.

If, again, these verbal coincidences are further analyzed, several interesting results are obtained. In the passages common to all these Evangelists about one-sixth consists of verbal coincidences, and of these one-fifth occurs in the narrative, and four-fifths in the recitative parts. In the same sections the additions common to St. Matthew and St. Mark contain five-sixths of their verbal coincidences in the recitative portions; and those common to St. Mark and St. Luke,[2] and St. Matthew and St. Luke, with two unimportant exceptions, present no verbal coincidence except in such portions.[3] In the sections common to two Evangelists a similar law prevails. The verbal coincidences between St. Matthew and St. Luke are very

1 For these proportions I am indebted to Mr. Norton, *l. c.*

2 The most remarkable similarities of fact and differences of language occur in Mark v. 3 ff. ‖; Luke viii. 27 ff.

3 One important observation was made by Marsh (Michaelis, *Introd. to New Testament*, v. 317), that when St. Matthew and St. Luke verbally agree in the common sections, St. Mark always agrees with them also. There is not a single instance of a verbal agreement in these sections between St. Matthew and St. Luke only.

numerous in the recital of our Lord's words, but the coincidences in the narrative cannot be rated at more than one-hundredth part of the others. Only one instance of verbal coincidence occurs in the numerous sections common only to St. Mark and St. Luke, and in this the coincidences in the narrative to those in the recitative part are as five to one. In the sections common to St. Matthew and St. Mark alone a different proportion obtains. In these the verbal coincidences in the narrative part are somewhat more than one-third of the whole number; but it is remarkable that in one important section (Mark vi. 17—29; Matt. xiv. 3—12) the only trace of a verbal coincidence occurs in the words ascribed to John the Baptist.

But in order to give these proportions only their due force, account must be taken of the proportion which the narrative and recitative parts of the Gospels bear to one another. Roughly, then, it may be said that the narrative in St. Matthew forms about one-fourth of the Gospel, in St. Mark about one-half, in St. Luke about one-third. If these proportions are combined with the aggregate of coincidences in the several Gospels, and the contents of each Gospel represented by 100, the following table is obtained:

	(α) Narrative.	(β) Recitative.	(γ) Coincidences. in (α).	(δ) Coincidences. in (β).
St. Matthew,	25	75	2.08	14.56
St. Mark,	50	50	3.33	13.33
St. Luke,	34	66	.50	9.50

Or, in other words, verbal coincidences are more frequent in the recitative than in the narrative portions of St. Matthew, in the proportion (nearly) of 12 : 5, of St. Mark, of 4 : 1, and of St. Luke, of 9 : 1.

The explanation of the concordances must also explain their distribution.

The general harmony and distinctness of the results which have been obtained by these various analyses shows that they must be taken into account in considering the general problem of

the concordances of the Synoptists. There is a marked difference between the composition of the recitative and narrative parts of the Gospels. In the former there is a prevailing unity, in the latter an individual style. The transition from the one to the other is often clear and decided, and the most remarkable coincidences are, in several instances, prefaced by the most characteristic differences. It is evident then that the problem involves two distinct conditions, and a satisfactory solution must account not only for the general similarity which the Gospels exhibit in their construction and contents, but also for the peculiar distribution of their verbal coincidences. Any theory which leaves one or other of these points unexplained must be considered inadequate and untrue.

ii. *The differences in the Gospels correspond with their concordances.*

The difference in language between the narrative and recitative parts of the Gospels points the way to those characteristic peculiarities by which they are respectively marked, which are, as has been already said, scarcely less striking than their general likeness. The three records are distinct, as well as similar, in plan and incident and style. Each presents the form of a complete whole, whose several parts are subordinated to the production of one great effect. Each contains additions to the common matter, which are not distinguishable externally from the other parts; and the Gospel of St. Mark, which contains the fewest substantive additions, presents the greatest number of fresh details in the account of common incidents. Each is marked by peculiarities of language, which, notwithstanding the limits within which they are confined, penetrate throughout its contents. In many cases, as in the genealogies, and in the narratives of the Passion and the Resurrection, these differences amount to serious difficulties, from our ignorance of all the circumstances on which the accounts depend; and even where it is not so, they are distinct and numerous, and offer as clear a proof of

the actual independence of the Gospels as the concordances offer of their original connection.[1]

(6) *The solutions proposed.*

Such, in a brief summary, are the peculiarities which the Synoptic Gospels present, and which the true account of their origin must explain. This explanation has been sought in the application of two distinct principles. One class of solutions rests upon the assumption that the later Evangelists made use of the writings of their predecessors; another supposes that the similarity is to be traced to the use of common sources, either written or oral. To these distinct methods of solution a third class may be added, which consists of various combinations of modified forms of the two others.

i. *Mutual dependence.*

The first class of solutions contains every possible combination of the Gospels. Each in turn has been supposed to furnish the basis of the others; each to occupy the mean position; each to represent the final narrative.[2] This variety of opinion is in itself an objection to the hypothesis, for it is a case where it might seem reasonable to expect a clear and unquestionable proof of dependence. But it is further evident that the assumption of a mutual dependence, while it may explain the general coincidences between the Gospels, offers no explanation of the peculiar distribution of the coincidences, or of the differences between the several narratives. It appears to be inconsistent with the results of a careful analysis of the language and of the contents of the Gospels. Every attempt to show on this

1 The peculiarities of plan, incident, and language, which characterize the different Gospels, will come under notice subsequently; at present, it is enough to state the results which will be then established. The most minute and valuable contribution to the criticism of the verbal characteristics of the evangelists is that of Gersdorf, *Beitrage zur Sprach-Characteristik der Schriftsteller des Neuen Testaments*, Leipzig, 1816, which at the same time offers the most striking confirmation of the text of the oldest family of MSS., but it treats the subject grammatically rather than linguistically.

2 Compare Marsh's *Dissertation*, etc. pp. 172 ff. The exceptions which he notices have been removed. Cf. Reuss, *Die Gesch. d. Neuen Testaments*, § 180.

hypothesis why a later Evangelist has omitted details which are noted by an earlier one; why he adopted his language up to a certain point, and then suddenly abandoned it; why he retained in some sentences nothing more than a remarkable word, and in others the fulness of an entire answer, has always failed. Nor is this an inconsiderable objection. If the coincidences of the Gospels are due to mutual use, the divergences cannot but be designed. Such a design, however, as would satisfy this hypothesis is not discoverable in the Gospels. The true purpose which may be traced in the writing of each Evangelist is naturally explicable on very different principles from those which are involved in the minute criticism and elaborate reconstruction of former works. The superficial incongruities and apparent contradictions which are found in the different Gospels are inconsistent with the close connection which the hypothesis requires; and the general notion is as foreign to the spirit of the Apostolic age as it is to the current of ecclesiastical tradition. In its simple form, the "supplemental" or "dependent" theory is at once inadequate for the solution of the difficulties of the relation of the synoptic Gospels and inconsistent with many of its details; and, as a natural consequence of the deeper study of the Gospels, it is now generally abandoned, except in combination with the other principle of solution.

ii. *Common sources.*

This second principle consists in the recognition of one or more common sources from which our present Gospels are supposed to have been derived.[1] But the principle admits of very varied application. The common sources may have been

1 This principle is stated by Epiphanius in general terms: *Hær.* li. 6. οὐχὶ ἑκάστῳ ἐμέρισεν ὁ θεὸς ἵνα οἱ τέσσαρες εὐαγγελισταὶ . . . τὰ μὲν συμφώνως καὶ ἴσως κηρύξωσιν, ἵνα δειχθῶσιν ὅτι ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς πηγῆς ὥρμηνται, τὰ δὲ ἑκάστῳ παραληφθέντα (l. παραλειφθέντα), ἄλλος διηγήσεται (l. -ηται) ὃς ἔλαβε παρὰ τοῦ πνεύματος μέρος τῆς ἀναλογίας. But he does not further explain what he understands by "the same source," though his words evidently suit better an oral than a written source.

written or oral, and thus two distinct theories arise, which have in turn been subjected to various modifications.

a. Written.

The simplest form in which the hypothesis was first distinctly brought forward consisted in the recognition of certain original Greek documents, which were supposed to have furnished the foundation of the synoptic Gospels, and then to have passed out of use.[1] A closer examination of the synoptic Gospels showed the inadequacy of this supposition to explain the phenomena which they present; and the historical difficulties which it involved were even greater than those of the "supplemental" hypothesis. The changing limits of coincidence and variation, together with a general identity of plan, remained still unexplained; and the loss of a Greek Protevangelium necessarily appeared inconceivable. In a short time a new theory was proposed. An Aramaic document was substituted for the Greek one; and it was argued that the various Greek translations of this original text might be expected to combine resemblances and differences like those which exist in the Gospels.[2] This opinion was not exposed to some of the most obvious objections which were urged against a Greek original, and it carried the explanation of the partial coincidences of the Evangelists one step further; but it was in detail scarcely more tenable. Though the loss of an Aramaic text is in itself not unlikely, yet the absence of all mention of the existence of such a document is a serious objection to its reality;[3] and the translation of a common original would not explain the peculiar distribution of the verbal coincidences of the Gospels which has been pointed out. In addition to this, the existence of any single written source would leave the phe-

1 J. D. Michaelis (*Introd.* 4th Ed.). The idea was first cursorily expressed by Le Clerc (1716). Cf. Marsh, pp. 184 ff. Schleiermacher afterwards revived the opinion in his *Essay on St. Luke*, 1817.

2 Lessing (1778); Semler (1783); Niemeyer (1790), etc. Cf. Marsh, p. 186 ff.

3 Some endeavored to obviate this objection by identifying the Aramaic Gospel with "*the Gospel according to the Hebrews*," or the Hebrew St. Matthew. Cf. De Wette, *Einl.* § 84 A.

nomena of the differences of the Gospels still unaccounted for. To explain these, fresh and more complex hypotheses were devised.[1] It was at last argued that the original Aramaic Gospel, which formed the basis of the common parts of the three Gospels, was used by the three Evangelists after it had been variously increased by new additions. It was further supposed that St. Mark and St. Luke used a Greek translation of the original Aramaic Gospel free from interpolation; and that the Greek translator of the Hebrew St. Matthew made use in the first instance of St. Mark, where he had matter in common with St. Matthew, and in other places, where St. Mark failed him, of St. Luke.[2] This hypothesis is certainly capable of being so adapted as to explain all the coincidences and differences of the Gospels, as, in fact, it is little more than the complement of an analysis of them; but the extreme artificiality by which it is characterized renders it wholly improbable as a true solution of the problem. Such a combination of research and mechanical skill in composition as it involves is wholly alien from the circumstances of the apostolic age, and at variance with the prevailing power of a wide-spread tradition. In dealing with this elaborate scheme the instinct of criticism at once anticipated the result of closer inquiry. In spite of the acuteness and ingenuity by which it was supported, it found little favor, and served to bring into discredit the belief in common written sources of the Gospels, by showing that any combination less subtle and varied was unable to satisfy all the conditions of the case.

In the meantime a clearer light had been thrown upon

1 Eichhorn's first hypothesis naturally intervenes, but it is needless to criticize this, or his later and still more elaborate one. The first is examined by Marsh (l. c. *infr.*), and the latter described by De Wette, *Einl.* § 84 D. The same remark will apply to the theory of Gratz. Cf. Meyer, *Comm. ü. d. N. T.* i. 1. p. 22.

2 Marsh, *Essay on the Origin of the first three Gospels*, appended to his translation of Michaelis' *Introduction*, Ed. 2. Vol. iii. part 2, Lond. 1802.

the existence and character of the traditional Gospel,[1] and the recognition of its general influence was combined with former hypotheses. It was supposed that the Aramaic record of St. Matthew and the memoirs which St. Mark framed from the preaching of St. Peter were the written basis on which the present Gospels were formed by the help of the current tradition.[2] But the same arguments which established the independence of the written Gospels when their similarity was deduced from their mutual dependence, equally establish it when they are referred to a current tradition as their original source. And, on the other hand, while it is certain from the testimony of St. Luke that various narratives of the whole or of parts of the Apostolic tradition were current, yet these unauthoritative or partial documents, as has been already shown, are incapable of giving an explanation of the complicated phenomena of the Gospels, to whatever source they are themselves referred. At the same time they may have exercised a considerable influence upon the mass of Christians, preserving among them the general form and substance of the tradition; and while they satisfied the want of the Church at large, they may have contributed to confine our knowledge of the Lord's life within the present narrow limits by discouraging the search for further information. But the existence and use of these isolated narratives, like the corresponding records of the Jewish tradition, were signs, and not causes, of the presence of an oral history; and, as long as the Apostles survived, the pure tradition must have been still preserved among them, independent of such helps. To seek for such fragments in our existing Gospels is simply to open the way to mere conjecture. In default of all external evidence, it is impossible to separate the present Gospels, on

b. Written and oral.

1 Especially by Gieseler, *Historisch-Kritischer Versuch u. s. w.* Leipzig, 1818.

2 This view is supported by Credner (*Einl.* §§ 86 ff.), and with somewhat different details by Reuss (*Gesch. d. N. T.* § 185 ff.).

internal grounds, into any distinct constituent parts. Each is a separate organic whole, simple and uniform, even where it has the closest resemblance to the parallel record.

A fresh attempt, however, has been made lately[1] to dissect the Gospels into their original components, which claims notice from its boldness, and serves at the same time as an example of the arbitrary results of subjective criticism. An original Greek Gospel, containing the records of the Baptism, the Temptation in its simplest form, and the Passion, is taken as the substruction; and it is further conjectured that this was used by St. Paul, and perhaps composed by the Evangelist, St. Philip. This document was followed by the Hebrew "collection of sayings" (λόγια) of St. Matthew, which included the greater part of the Lord's discourses with introductory narratives. Then followed the narrative of St. Mark, which, though an independent work, was yet written by one who was acquainted with the two former records. These three elements, together with new additions and passages from "a book of higher history," were wrought up into the present Gospel of St. Matthew. Afterwards, three anonymous Evangelists are supposed to have revised the narrative, which received its last form at the hands of St. Luke. Such a hypothesis can scarcely claim much attention as an explanation of the actual origin of the Gospels, though it may throw some light on the growth of the tradition of which they are the records. It is as a whole inconsistent with the unity of plan and the unity of language by which the Gospels are marked. If they were really the mere mosaic which would result from such a combination, it would be impossible that they should be so distinctly individualized by peculiarities of form and construction which penetrate through every part of them. Above all, and this remark applies to all the explanations which depend on the use of common documents, such a hypothesis is inconsistent with

The Gospels are organic wholes.

1 By Ewald, *Jahrbücher*, 1848, 1849.

the language of St. Luke's preface, which points clearly to an oral tradition as the source of his own Gospel, and by implication of the corresponding parts in the other Gospels; and this last alternative of a common oral source of the synoptic Gospels is, perhaps, alone able to satisfy, simply and completely, the different conditions of the problem which the Gospels present.

c. Oral.

It has been shown already that the hypothesis of an oral Gospel is most consistent with the general habit of the Jews[1] and the peculiar position of the Apostles: that it is supported by the earliest direct testimony, and in some degree implied in the Apostolic writings. The result of the examination of the internal character of the Gospels is not less favorable to its adoption than the weight of external evidence.[2]

In relation to the form and substance of the Gospels;

The general form of the Gospels points to an oral source. A minute biography or a series of annals, which are the simplest and most natural forms of writing, are the least natural forms of tradition, and the farthest removed from the Evangelic narratives, which consist of striking scenes and discourses, such as must have lived long in the memories of those who witnessed them. Nor are the Gospels fashioned only on an oral type; they are fashioned also upon that type which is preserved in the other Apostolic writings. The oral Gospel, as far as it can be traced in the Acts and the Epistles, centred in the crowning facts of the Passion and the Resurrection, while the earlier ministry of the Lord was regarded chiefly in relation to its final issue. In a narrative composed on such a plan, it is evident that the

1 At a later period, Eusebius says of Hegesippus, that ἄλλα ὡς ἂν ἐξ Ἰουδαϊκῆς ἀγράφου παραδόσεως μνημονεύει, characterizing at once the man and the nation. (*H. E.* iv. 22.)

2 The hypothesis was first proposed in detail by Gieseler in the work already quoted. In later times it has been supported by Guericke, *Einl.* § 19, Thiersch, *Versuch zur Herstellung, u. s. w.* 119 ff., and Norton, *Genuineness of the Gospels*, i. note D. Dr. Davidson (*Introd.* i. 404 ff.) allows considerable weight to tradition, while he admits the use of written documents.

record of the last stage of Christ's work would be conspicuous for detail and fulness, and that the events chosen to represent the salient features of its earlier course would be combined together without special reference to date or even to sequence. Viewed in the light of its end, the whole period was one in essence, undivided by years or festivals, and the record would be marked not so much by divisions of time as by groups of events.[1] In all these respects the synoptic Gospels exactly represent the probable form of the first oral Gospel. They seem to have been shaped by the pressure of recurring needs, and not by the deliberate forethought of their authors. In their common features they seem to be that which the earliest history declares they are, the summary of the Apostolic preaching, the historic groundwork of the Church.

and to their subsequent modifications.

The transition from the earliest oral Gospel to the specific forms which it afterwards assumed is capable of being easily realized. The great steps in the process are still marked in the Gospels themselves. The Gospel of St. Mark, conspicuous for its vivid simplicity, seems to be the most direct representation of the first evangelic tradition, the common foundation on which the others were reared. In essence, if not in composition, it is the oldest; and the absence of the history of the Infancy brings its contents within the limits laid down by St. Peter for the extent of the Apostolic testimony. The great outline thus drawn admitted of the introduction of large groups of facts or discourses combined to illustrate or enforce some special lesson. In this way the common tradition gained its special characters, but still remained a tradition, gaining fixity and distinctness, till it was at last embodied in writing. For the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke represent the

1 Such groups of events occur in the constant connection of the healing of the Paralytic and the call of Matthew; of the plucking the ears of corn and the healing of the withered hand; of the fear of Herod, the feeding of the five thousand, and the confession of Peter.

two great types of recension to which it may be supposed that the simple narrative was subjected. St. Luke presents the Hellenic, and St. Matthew (Greek) the later Hebraic form of the tradition, and in its present shape the latter seems to give the last authentic record of the primitive Gospel.[1] Yet in both these a common tradition furnished the centre and basis on which the after works were built up. The original principles of combination regulated the later additions, and a clear resemblance of shape remained in the fuller narrative.

In relation to the language of the Gospels.

In this way the successive remoulding of the oral Gospel according to the peculiar requirements of different classes of hearers, furnishes a natural explanation of the general similarity in form and substance between the several Gospels, combined with peculiarities and differences in arrangement and contents. The assumption of a common oral source is equally capable of explaining the phenomena of the language of the Gospels. The words of the Lord and the questions proposed to Him would necessarily first be fixed, while the narrative by which they were introduced remained more free. Single phrases would be impressed with peculiar force; and the recurrence of strange words in the same connection, in the different Evangelists, even when the construction of the sentence is changed, seems scarcely to admit of a simple explanation, except on the admission of a traditional record.[2] And while the free

1 The order thus given, St. Mark, St. Luke, St. Matthew (Greek), represents the probable order of precedence of the *forms* of the narrative which they give. It may or may not coincide with the order of writing; for it is of course possible that an earlier form of the apostolic tradition may have been committed to writing at a later period. This is an important fact which seems to have been wholly overlooked by critics.

2 E. g., ἀπαρθῇ, Matt. ix. 15 ‖ ‖; ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν, Matt. xvi. 24 ‖ ‖; γεύσωνται θανάτου, Matt. xvi. 28 ‖ ‖; δυσκόλως, Matt. xix. 23 ‖ ‖; Matt. iv. 5 = Luke iv. 9, πτερύγιον; Matt. vii. 5 = Luke vi. 42, διαβλέψεις; Matt. xi. 11 = Luke vii. 28, ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν; Matt. xxi. 44 = Luke xx. 18, συνθλασθήσεται, λικμήσει; Mark vi. 41 = Luke ix. 16, κατέκλασε; Mark xiv. 15 = Luke xxii. 12, ἀνάγαιον; Matt. xxiv. 22 = Mark xiii. 20, κολοβοῦν; Matt. xxvi. 55 = Mark xiv. 48, συλλαβεῖν. Compare also Matt. iii. 3 ‖ ‖. τὰς τρί-

development of common materials gave full scope for variations in detail, as well as for interpolations of fresh matter, it includes the preservation of language hallowed by long use in its well-known shape. Nor is it an unimportant fact, that in this respect also St. Mark occupies the mean position between the other Evangelists, as would naturally be the case if he represents most closely the original from which they started.

Tradition the parent of Myths.

But while it is allowed that the prevalence of an oral tradition, varied by the influence of circumstances, might furnish an adequate explanation of the concordances and differences of the Gospels, the very plasticity of tradition is turned into an argument against the hypothesis. It has been argued that tradition is the parent of fable, and that to admit a traditional source for the Gospels is to sacrifice their historic value. The objection appears to rest upon two misconceptions. It disregards, so to speak, the traditional education of the period, and arbitrarily extends the period during which the tradition was paramount. It has been shown already that the Jews preserved with strict accuracy the interpretations of the Law and the sayings of the great teachers; and even if it had not been so, it would have been sufficient to point to the difference between an age of hearing and an age of reading to remove the suspicion raised against the tradition of the first age from the uncertainty of tradition now. But, more than this, the Evangelic tradition existed as such alone only during the lifetime of those who were the authors of it. No period was left for any mythic embellishment. As long as the first witnesses survived, so long the tradition was confined within the bounds of their testimony; when they passed away, it was already fixed in writing.

The objection answered.

βους αὐτοῦ; Matt. iv. 10 = Luke iv. 8, προσκυνήσεις, where the Evangelists agree in differing from the LXX. These coincidences are all noted by Bp. Marsh in his *Comment.* pp. 211 ff.

Other objections may perhaps be urged against the hypothesis of a definite oral Gospel,[1] chiefly from a misunderstanding of the spirit and work of the Apostolic times; but, without affecting to say that it removes every difficulty in the mutual relations of the written Gospels, it explains so much with perfect simplicity and naturalness, that it would be unreasonable not to acquiesce readily in the existence of some doubts. Parts of the tradition may have been committed to writing from time to time; many, as St. Luke says, may have attempted to arrange the whole in a continuous narrative, but still it remained essentially a tradition in the first age, and as such found its authoritative expression in our Gospels. Under what characteristic forms and with what various shades of feeling the common materials were moulded, remains a subject for future inquiry.

1 Hug, *Einl.* 95 ff. Wiesse, *Die Evangelienfrage*, 141 ff. Compare also Baur, *Die Kanon. Evangelien*, pp. 32 f., who gives a good outline and criticism of the different schemes of the origin of the Gospels.

CHAPTER IV.

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GOSPELS.

Willst du ins Unendliche schreiten,
Geh nur im Endlichen nach allen Seiten. — GOETHE.

THE Bible, like the Church, gains fresh force and strength in times of trial. As long as it is unassailed, it is also in a great measure unstudied. It is received as a whole with unquestioning reverence, but the characteristics of its component elements are undistinguished. A vague sense of the general unity of the books of which it is composed takes the place of a clear view of their organic union. Their independence and variety, their vital connection with periods widely separated in time and thought, their individual traits and original objects, are neglected in that traditional view which sees in all one uniform and changeless revelation, neither special in its destination nor progressive in its course.

Times of calm belief unfavorable to the study of the Bible.

These remarks, which apply with more or less force to all the books of Scripture, are especially applicable to the Gospels. The assaults which have been made in late times upon their historic truth have brought out with the most striking clearness their separate characteristics, and it has even been argued that they were composed designedly to further particular views. This exaggeration of the truth, though wholly inconsistent with their perfect simplicity, is yet a valuable protest against that theory

The characteristics of the Gospels brought out by modern controversy.

which represents them as casual collections of evangelic fragments, and opens the way to a true appreciation of their claims. Together they bear the same relation to the whole apostolic tradition as they bear severally to one another.[1] The common record and the separate records have a representative value. The three synoptic Gospels are not mere repetitions of one narrative, but distinct views of a complex whole. They are the same, and yet they are fresh. The great landmarks of the history are unchanged; the same salient points reappear in all, but they are found in new combinations and with new details, as the features of a landscape or the outlines of a figure when viewed from various points.

The general character of their difference.

Outwardly, the Gospels are the reflex of individual impressions. We never find, even in the prophets, that the personal character of the divine messenger is neutralized; and much more may we expect to find a distinct personality, so to speak, in the writing of the Evangelists, whose inspiration was no ecstatic impulse, but the consecration of a whole life, the conversion of an entire being into a divine agency. For the Gospels, like the Gospel, are most divine because they are most human. As the clear expression of that which individual men seized and treasured up as the image of their Saviour's life, they convey to other men the same living picture in the freshness of its local coloring. And this coloring is of the

I. This individualized character is implied in the idea of an inspired history.

1 A curious trace of the recognition of the representative character of the written Gospels is found in the inscriptions of the Gospels in *Codd.* 69 (*Cod. Leicestr.*), 178: ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ Ματθαῖον ἁγίου εὐαγγελίου κ. τ. λ. A similar inscription occurs in two of Matthaei's MSS.

It may be observed that the force of the preposition in the phrase τὸ κατὰ [M] εὐαγγέλιον points primarily to the authority and source (e. g., κατὰ Θουκυδίδην), "the Gospel of Christ according to [the arrangement and teaching of] M.," though it may, in a secondary sense, include authorship.

From Mr. Scrivener's admirable collation, I find that the reading in *Cod. Leicestr.* is ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ [M] εὐαγγέλιον. In St. John, εὐαγγέλιον ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννην.

essence of the picture. The only conception which we can form of the inspiration of a historic record lies in the divine fitness of the outward dress in which the facts are at once embodied and veiled. No record of any fact can be complete. The relations of the most trivial occurrence transcend all power of observation; and the truthfulness of special details is no pledge of the truthfulness of the whole impression. The connection and relation and subordination of the various parts, the description and suppression of particular incidents, the choice of language and style, combine to make a history true or false in its higher significance, and belong to that "poetic" power which is the highest and rarest gift of the historian. This power the Evangelists possessed in the fact that they were penetrated with the truths of which they spoke. The Spirit which was in them searched the deep things of God, and led them to realize the mysteries of the faith, not indeed in their infinite essence, but as finite conceptions. And would not such writers above all others compose in an unconscious order? would not the great facts of the Gospel assume in grouping and detail the subjective impress of their minds, as they selected and arranged them with all truthfulness and divine enlightenment? Popular history is universally the truest reflex of popular opinion; and where distortion and embellishment are excluded by the multiplicity of the record, the human interest of the narrative is one of the most powerful means for the propagation of the divine message. The Gospel emphatically speaks to men by men, and recognizes their intellectual differences, which it converts in different ways to God's glory. In like manner the Evangelists wrote the story of man's salvation, each as the type of one mighty section of mankind, as they personally felt the need of a Saviour, and acknowledged His power. The truth on which this statement rests lies at the very foundation of the Christian faith, for as the Son of God was made man for our redemption, so the Spirit of God spoke through men for our instruction.

The differences between the Gospels not only natural, but even necessary, from

The contrast between the Gospel of St. John and the Synoptic Gospels, both in substance and in individual character, is obvious at first sight; but the characteristic differences of the synoptic Gospels, which are formed on the same foundation and with common materials, are less observed. Yet these differences are not less important than the former, and belong equally to the complete portraiture of the Saviour, which comprised the fulness of an outward presence, as well as the depth of a secret life. In this respect the records correspond to the subjects. The first record is manifold; the second is one; the first is based on the experience of a society, the second on the intuition of a loved disciple. Even in date they arise out of distinct periods. The spiritual Gospel belonged to a late stage in the growth of the Church, when Christianity was seen clearly to rise above the ruins of an "old world;" the "fleshly" Gospels were contemporaneous in essence with the origin of the Church itself, and were shaped by the providential course of its early history. But this natural and social growth, so to speak, invested the synoptic Gospels with a permanent and special power, which must continue to work its effects as long as human character remains the same. Each narrative, in which the common facts were moulded, was in this way the spontaneous expression of a distinct form of thought, springing out of peculiar circumstances, governed by special laws of combination, destined at first to meet the wants of a marked class, and adapted to satisfy in after times the requirements of those who embody from time to time, in changing shapes, the feeling by which it was first inspired. In whatever view we regard the origin of the Gospels, this multiformity appears to be as necessary as it was natural. On the one side the separate aspects of the subject and the various elements combined in the early Church, on the other the recurrent phases of the human mind, which are found in every age, seem to call for some distinct recogni-

tion, and to suggest the belief that each Gospel may fulfil a representative function in the exhibition of the Divine Life. Nor can such a belief be dismissed at once as resting on mere fanciful analogies, though it is as difficult to express in their full force the arguments by which it is supported as it is to resolve a general impression into the various elements by which it is produced. The proper proof of the fact that each Gospel has its distinctive worth springs from personal investigation; but such at least was the conviction in which the great students of former times applied themselves to the examination of the Gospels; and the fuller materials and surer criticism which are now the inheritance of the scholar, promise proportionately larger results to that labor which is most truthful, because it is also most patient and most reverent.

1. *The nature of the subject.*

The subject of the Gospel — the history of the new creation — the manifestation of perfect humanity — "the prophetic image of the glorified life"[1] — transcends, according to the analogy of the earlier Messianic types, the scope of one narrator. The first creation was the creation of a harmonious world, the second was the reunion of the elements which sin had divided. Step by step in the progress of Jewish history, successive features of the coming Saviour were embodied in the Law, — the kingdom, the prophets, the seers; and the record of the fulfilment of that to which these all pointed could scarcely have been less varied. The twofold nature and complete manhood of Christ seem to require a representation at least as distinct as the prophetic teaching of the Law from the visions of Daniel. In earlier times patriarchs and kings and prophets foreshadowed in their lives fragments of the work of Messiah; and so when He came, His work contained implicitly the fulness of that which they prefigured. The archetypal life

[1] [Εὐαγγέλιον] — τοῦ ἐξ ἀναστάσεως βίου προδιατύπωσις definition of Basil (*De sp. S.* xv. ap. Suic. *Thes.* s. v. εὐαγγ.).

which summed up the fragmentary teaching of the past embraced the various separate developments of the future. On the one side we see the many forms of the humanity of Christ; on the other the unchanging immanence of His Godhead. The bearings of each act, and the teaching of each discourse, are necessarily infinite, for He spoke and acted as the representative of men.[1] Variety in the record is necessary to the completeness of the portraiture; the manifoldness even of the outward life of the Lord exceeds the limits of one historic type.[2] The written memorial is necessarily partial, and, to borrow the language of geometry, superficial; while the living fact is entire and solid. To the simple believer the whole becomes intelligible by the separate contemplation of the parts. And if Christ be our Pattern, as well as our Redeemer: if we must realize the fulness of His manhood for the direction of our energies, as well as truthfulness of His Godhead for the assurance of our faith: — it must be by comparing the distinct outlines of His life, taken from the different centres of human thought and feeling; for it is with the spiritual as with the natural vision, the truest picture is presented to the mind, not by the absolute coincidence of several images, but by the harmonious combination of their diversities.

Eph. iv. 13.

The varied fulness of Christian truth is seen from the first in the constitution of the Church. The first circle of its human teachers represents, in characteristic distinctness, the different aspects under which it may be viewed, developing in harmonious completeness the outlines which the prophets had drawn before.[3] It seems, indeed, at first

2. The various elements coexistent in the Apostolic teaching.

1 Compare Neander's *Life of Christ*, § 71 (E. Tr.); *Church History*, ii. pp. 1—5 (E. Tr.); Olshausen's *Commentar. Einl.* § 2.

2 The judgment of Chrysostom in this respect appears to fall short of the full truth (*Hom. i. in Matt.* ap. Suicer *l. c.*) οὐκ ἤρκει εἷς εὐαγγελιστὴς πάντα εἰπεῖν; — ἤρκει μὲν ἀλλὰ . . . [ἐκ τεσσάρων] μεγίστη τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπόδειξις γίγνεται.

3 Neander (*Gesch. d. Pflanz. d. Christl. Kirche*, 564—796) has followed out the various forms of early Christian teach-

sight, when we picture the apostolic age as a living scene, as if all unity of doctrine were lost in the diversities of the Apostles, as they appropriated and embodied each in a *finite* form the *infinite* principles of their common Master. With some the mysterious glories of the ancient creed were mingled with the purer light of Christianity; and they transferred the majesty of the Mosaic law, which they had observed with reverent or even ascetic devotion,[1] to the new and spiritual faith. St James[2] sets before us this form of Christianity. He contemplates it from the side of Judaism, as the final end and aim of the earlier training. Standing, as we may believe, in a close natural relation with the Saviour, he puts aside all remembrance of that connection, and even of the personal presence of the Lord,[3] that he may dwell with the freedom and vigor of a prophet on the principles which He had established. His view of Christianity, to use a popular word, is objective. In this aspect "faith" is an intellectual belief in a fact, while "works" are the only outward proof of spiritual vitality. The Gospel is contemplated as a Law, though it is "a royal Law," and "a Law of freedom." The essence of external religion (θρησκεία), which the ancient ritual regarded, is laid open in the practice of Christian virtue. Christianity is thus like a flower, which is fuller indeed and more perfect than the bud from which it opens, while it still rests upon the same support and is confined within the same circle.

St. James.

James ii. 8; i. 25; ii. 12.

ing with equal judgment and sagacity. In times of inward discord no truth can be more precious than "the manifoldness of Christ in its oneness;" and nowhere is it more distinctly seen than in the Scriptures.

1 Cf. Hegesippus ap. Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23.

2 Cf. Gal. ii. 12; Acts xv. 13. Though St. Peter was "the apostle of the circumcision," he does not personify the Jewish party, but rather, as the representation of the Catholic Church, mediates between them and St. Paul. Cf. Neander, *Gesch. d. Pflanz.* 507.

3 The name *Jesus Christ* only occurs twice; i. 1; ii. 1; and the epistle contains no allusion to the Passion and Resurrection of Christ, though it presents some of the closest parallels to the language of the Gospels. Cf. p. 186 *n.* 2.

The antithesis to this view is found in that of one who was called to believe in a glorified Lord, and not to follow a suffering Teacher. St. Paul was separated from the other apostles by the widest differences of habit and training, and the change which attended his acceptance of the Gospel was as violent as it was sudden. With him Christianity was not so much a prepared result as a new creation; and when the Church chose his conversion for special commemoration, it can hardly have been without the instinctive feeling that this was to him what death was to the other saints, — the entrance into a higher life. "Old things had passed away;" and only "faith" — the willing surrender of the whole being to a supreme power — was felt to furnish the entrance into the heavenly kingdom.[1] In such a connection "works," which might proceed from the spirit of servile obedience, sunk into the rank of a mere symptom, instead of being the central fact. Yet these antithetical views of "faith" and "works" — the outer and the inner — are not contradictory, but supplementary. They can be no more set in opposition than the convexity and concavity of a curve. The common terms must be interpreted in accordance with the position of the writers before they are compared. And at last the teaching of the Apostles must be combined and not identified, for we lose the fulness of the truth if we attempt to make out their literal accordance. They wrought differently for the establishment of the Christian society, and they wrote differently to direct its future development.

St. Paul.

2 *Cor.* v. 17 (τὰ ἀρχαῖα).

But there was yet another side of Christianity which was exhibited in the apostolic teaching.[2] It was not only a system of practical religion

St. Peter.

1 Cf. Acts xiv. 27, θύραν πίστεως, which stands in close relation with the words of our Lord (John x. 7), and the remarkable phrase which occurs in the history of St. James: Heges. ap. Euseb. *l. c.* ἀπάγγειλον ἡμῖν τίς ἡ θύρα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ σταυρωθέντος.

2 The teaching of St. John, as has been remarked already, belonged to a later period. See Chap. v.

and a form of spiritual growth, but it was also a fresh element in the social world. St. Peter exhibited this organizing power of the new faith. According to the significant promise which was expressed in his name,[1] he laid the foundations of the Jewish and the heathen churches, while the task of fixing or completing their future structure was left to others. His activity was not directed by a review of the conditions of man's outward piety, or the requirements of his spiritual instincts, but sprung from his *lively hope* in a sovereign Lord.

Acts ii. 37—41; *x.* 44—48.

1 *Pet. i.* 3.

Each of the great aspects of human life, outward and inward, in the individual and in society, are thus represented in the forms of apostolic teaching. The external service of God by works of charity, the internal sanctification of man's powers by faith, and the perpetual maintenance of the rights and blessings of a Church, combine to complete the idea of Christianity as exhibited by the first circle of the Apostles; and we are naturally inclined to look for some analogous variety in the form of the inspired records of His life from whence the apostolic wisdom came.

3. The forms of thought current in the Apostolic age.

If we extend our view yet further beyond the limits of the Jewish people, these different tendencies which existed among the Apostles will be found exhibited on a much larger scale and in more distinct clearness. The universality of the Gospel was attested from the first by the fact that it was

1 Cf. Pearson *On the Creed*, p. 336 *n.* Yet it is of importance to bear in mind the distinction between πέτρος and πέτρα (Matt. xvi. 18), between the *isolated mass* and the *living rock*. The one is the representation of, and suggests the existence of, the other (cf. Donaldson, *New Cratylus*, § 15). Cypr. *De unit. Eccles.* 4; Hoc erant utique et cæteri apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio prædíti et honoris et potestatis, sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur [et primatus Petro datur, ut una Christi Ecclesia et cathedra una monstretur. Et pastores sunt omnes, et grex unus ostenditur, qui ab apostolis unanimi consensione pascatur], ut ecclesia Christi una monstretur. The interpolation of this passage shows what Cyprian would have written if he had acknowledged any such claims as the Bishop of Rome makes now.

welcomed by representatives of every class; and without leaving the records of the New Testament we read that it found reception with the earnest Jew who was *waiting for the consolation of Israel*, and served God in the Temple *with prayers and fastings day and night;* with the retainer of Cæsar's household (Cf. Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44; xiii. 32), removed alike from the influence of tradition, feeling, or philosophy; with the outcast publican, who *stood afar off*, as unworthy to approach his God; with the Areopagite, awakened to a sense of a future judgment; and, finally, with the cultivated disciple of the Alexandrine Schools, *fervent in spirit* and *mighty in the Scriptures.*[1] And these are not merely individuals, but just types of the various classes into which the Roman world was divided in its religious aspect. The characteristic feelings which they embodied express the cardinal tendencies of men, and mark the great divisions of the apostolic work. The Apostles had to unfold and declare the significance of the *Past.* They had to point out the substance of Christianity as shadowed forth in the earlier dispensation. They had to make known the mighty Lawgiver of a new covenant, the divine King of a spiritual Israel, the Prophet of a universal Church. They had to connect Christianity with Judaism.

JEW. *Luke ii. 25—37.*

ROMAN. *Phil. iv. 12.*

HELLENIST. *Matt. ix. 9.* [*Luke xviii. 13*]. *Acts xvii. 34.*

ALEXANDRINE. *Acts xviii. 24, 25.*

As looking to the

Past,

Yet more: they had to vindicate the claims of the *Present.* They had to set forth the activity and energy of the Lord's life, apart from the traditions of Moriah and Sinai; to exhibit the Gospel as a simple revelation from heaven; to follow the details of its announcement as they were apprehended in their living power by those who followed most closely on the steps of Christ. They had to connect Christianity with History.

Present,

1 The phrase ἀνὴρ λόγιος (Acts xviii. 24)—a learned man—carries us back to earlier notices of Egypt. Herod. ii. 3.

From another point of view they had to proclaim the hopefulness of the *Future*. They had to show that the Gospel fully satisfies the inmost wants of man's nature; that it not only removes "the leprosy of castes and the blindness of pagan sensuality," but gives help and strength to the hopeless sufferer, who has no one to put him in the healing waters, while it confers pardon on the returning prodigal and happiness on the believing robber. They had to connect Christianity with man.

Future.

John v. 7. Luke xv. xviii. 43.

Nor was this all: many there were whom their deep searching of the human heart had taught to feel the want of a present God. These longed to see their ardent aspirations realized in the life of the Saviour whom they had embraced, and to find their hopes confirmed and directed by His own words. For such a spiritual history was needed; and the Christian teachers had to exhibit our Lord in His eternal relations to the Father, alike manifested in the past, the present, and the future, as the Creator, the Redeemer, and the Judge. They had to connect Christianity with God.

Eternal *relations of Christianity.*

John i. 3; x. 15; xii. 48.

This variety in the forms of the Apostolic preaching, which was directed to meet the hope of the Jew and the energy of the Roman, to satisfy the cravings of our moral nature and the wants of our speculative reason, could not fail to influence the form in which the facts of the life of Christ were apprehended and grouped. These facts were the groundwork of all Christian teaching, and in virtue of their infinite bearings admitted of being variously combined. In this way the common evangelic narrative was modified in the special labors of the different apostles, and that which was designed to meet the requirements of one period was fitted to meet the requirements of all. For it is not enough to acknowledge the marvellous adaptation of the Gospel to the apostolic age. It was equally destined

By this variety the Gospel is adapted to all ages, in which

for all times; and in this sense our present Gospels, the records of the apostolic preaching, combine to form a holy τετρακτύς, "a fountain of eternal truth," in a deeper sense than any mystic harmony of the ancient sage.

old forms of thought are reproduced.

There are many whose thoughts still linger in the past, and who delight to trace with a vain regret "the glories which have passed from earth." To them St. Matthew speaks, as he did to the Jew of old, while he teaches that all which was great and good in former days was contained in the spirit, and not in the outward shape, and exhibits the working of Providence in the course of national history. There are many, again, whose sympathies are entirely with the present, who delight in the activity and warmth of daily life, who are occupied with things around them, without looking far beyond their own age and circle. To them St. Mark addresses a brief and pregnant narrative of the ministry of Christ, unconnected with any special recital of His birth and preparation for His work, and unconnected, at least in its present shape, with the mysterious history of the Ascension. Many, also, there must be in every age who dwell with peculiar affection on the Gospel of St. Luke, who delight to recognize the universality of our faith, whose thoughts anticipate the time when all shall hear the message of Christianity, who know no difference of class and acknowledge no claims of self-righteousness, but admit the bonds of a common humanity, and feel the necessity of a common Saviour. And, lastly, are there not those, even in an era of restless excitement, who love to retire from the busy scenes of action to dwell on the eternal mysteries which St. John opened for silent contemplation: men of divine eloquence and mighty in the understanding of the word, who water the churches which others have planted? No period of life, no variety of temperament, is left without its Gospel. The zealous and the pensive, the active and the thoughtful, may draw their peculiar support from the

1 *Cor. iii. 6.*

different Evangelists, and find in them their proper end and road.

These reflections, however, anticipate in some degree the answer to the question which arises more directly from the previous remarks. The varieties of opinion and feeling which distinguished the apostolic age and the body of the Apostles themselves, which were indeed only special forms of unchanging instincts of man's nature, suggest with more or less probability the antecedent likelihood of a manifold — even of a fourfold — Gospel. How far then, it may be asked, are our present Gospels fitted to represent the influence of these typical differences? How far are these differences implied in the character and position of our Evangelists? How far have they been historically recognized, either in the arbitrary conclusions of heretics or in the catholic teaching of the Church?

II. *The Evangelists in relation to these original types of Christian faith.*

On applying these questions to the Gospels the first feeling probably will be one of disappointment. It must appear strange that only one bears the name of an Apostle who is distinctly individualized in the events of the narrative itself. Nor is the obscurity of the early history of the Gospels relieved by the clearness of later records. With the exception of St. John, no one of the Evangelists rises into any prominence in the memorials of the first age, and tradition adds little to the few casual notices in which their names are found. But if we look deeper, this circumstance is itself a testimony to the simple truthfulness of the Ecclesiastical belief, when the names of the Gospels are contrasted with the more conspicuous titles of the Gospels of St. James and Nicodemus, and the preaching of St. Peter and St. Paul; and, on the other hand, all that can be gathered from external sources as to the position occupied by the authors of the books points to their representative character. In the broadest features of time and position there can be no doubt but that the Evangelists were widely

1. *The Evangelists generally not conspicuous in history or tradition,*

separated from one another. Whatever may have been the exact dates of the several books, they were certainly composed at long intervals, still longer if measured by the course of events and not by the lapse of years. The first probably was composed in its original form while the disciples *went* daily *to the Temple at the hours of prayer;* the last when Jerusalem was *trodden under foot of Gentiles* and *her house left unto her desolate.* The fundamental difference which is involved in this change of national position was further increased by the personal characteristics of the Evangelists. The publican of the Galilean lake, the companion of St. Paul, and the "son" and interpreter of St. Peter, are severally distinguished from one another no less than from the prophet of the Apocalypse; and the differences which thus lie upon the surface gain additional clearness in proportion as they are traced in detail as far as the meagre memorials of the first age enable us to follow them.

yet widely separated in date and character. Acts iii. 1.

Luke xxi. 24. Luke xiii. 35.

1 Pet. v. 13.

Tradition is constant in affirming that St. Matthew wrote his Gospel in Judea,—"while Peter and Paul were founding the Church at Rome," as Irenæus adds,[1]—for the use of Jewish converts, and in their national language.[2] "Having formerly preached

St. Matthew.

1 *Adv. Hær.* vi. 25 (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 8).

2 The original language of the Gospel of St. Matthew and the claims of the present Gospel to Apostolic authority have been made the subject of considerable discussion; yet an impartial view of the evidence which bears upon the question seems to point to a clear result. All early writers agree in affirming that St. Matthew wrote in "Hebrew" (Aramaic), and from them this belief gained universal currency till the era of the Reformation (Erasmus). At the same time all equally agree in accepting the *Greek* Gospel as the Gospel of St. Matthew, without noticing the existence of any doubt as to its authenticity. The earliest witness is Papias. "Matthew," he says, on the authority, as it appears, of the elder John, "composed the oracles (τὰ λόγια) in the Hebrew dialect; but each interpreted them as he could" (cf. p. 194 *n.* 1). One point in this testimony which seems to have been overlooked is of importance. The tenses mark two periods of the circulation of the Hebrew Gospel: one during which the Hebrew alone was current, and another in which the original authority of Papias lived, when individual trans-

to the Hebrews, when he was about to go to others also, he committed to writing in his native tongue his Gospel (τὸ κατ᾽ αὐτὸν εὐαγγέλιον), and so filled up by his writing that which was lacking in his presence." This testimony, it is true, refers to the Aramaic archetype, and not to our present Greek Gospel, but that Aramaic record furnished at once the substance and the characteristics of the Greek revision. The existing narrative is so complete and uniform in plan and style that it cannot have suffered any considerable change in the transition from one language to the other; and there is no sufficient reason to depart

lation was no longer needed (ἡρμήνευσε not ἑρμηνεύει). In other words, an authorized Greek representative of the Hebrew St. Matthew must have existed in the generation after the Apostles. The next witness is Irenæus, who says that "Matthew published a written Gospel in the Hebrew dialect" (*ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* v. 8), while he everywhere accepts the present text as an authentic work of the Apostle. The evidence of Origen is to the same effect (*ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25); and it is unnecessary to extend the inquiry lower down, for all external evidence is absolutely uniform in attesting the existence of a Hebrew archetype, and the authority of the present Gospel as the work of St. Matthew. But on the other side it is argued from internal evidence that the present Gospel bears no marks of being a translation, that several details in it point to a late and not to an early date, and that there is no evidence to show that any one who mentions the Hebrew original had seen it. The last objection is evidently unreasonable. Till it can be shown that the writers quoted are untrustworthy generally, it is purely arbitrary to reject their statement because it is not sufficiently explicit. The two other facts are perfectly consistent with a belief in the Hebrew original and in the Greek St. Matthew. It has been shown that the oral Gospel probably existed from the first, both in Aramaic and in Greek, and in this way a preparation for a Greek representative of the Hebrew Gospel was at once found. The parts of the Aramaic oral Gospel which were adopted by St. Matthew already existed in the Greek counterpart. The change was not so much a version as a substitution; and frequent coincidence with common parts of St. Mark and St. Luke, which were derived from the same oral Greek Gospel, was a necessary consequence. Yet it may have happened that as long as the Hebrew and Greek Churches were in close connection, perhaps till the destruction of Jerusalem, no authoritative Greek Gospel of St. Matthew, *i. e.*, such a revision of the Greek oral Gospel as would exactly answer to St. Matthew's revision of the Aramaic, was committed to writing. When, however, the separation between the two sections grew more marked, the Greek Gospel was written, not, indeed, as a translation, but as a representation of the original, as a Greek oral counterpart was already current; and at the same time those few additional notes were added which imply a later date than the substance of the book (Matt. xxviii. 15). By whose hand the Greek Gospel was drawn up is wholly unknown. The traditions which assign it to St. John or St. James are without any foundation in early writers.

from the unhesitating habit of the earliest writers who notice the subject in practically identifying the revised version with the original text, though, indeed, it was not so much an independent version as an adaptation of the oral Greek Gospel to the "preaching" of St. Matthew.[1]

St. MATTHEW. *Matt. ix. 9. Mark ii. 14. Luke v. 27.*

The details of St. Matthew's life which have been preserved are very scanty. There can, however, be little doubt that the "Matthew" of the first Gospel is the same as the "Levi" of the second and third, though the persons were distinguished even in very early times.[2] The change of name, which seems to have coincided with the crisis in the life of the Apostle, and probably bore some reference to it,[3] finds a

1 The view which has been given of the relation of the present Gospel of St. Matthew to the original Aramaic text and the oral Greek Gospels, which was the common basis of the two other Synoptists, receives a remarkable confirmation from the peculiarities of the Old Testament citations which it contains. These may be divided into two distinct classes: the first consisting of such passages as are quoted by the Evangelist himself, as fulfilled in the events of the life of Christ; the second, of such as are inwoven into the discourse of the different characters, and form an integral part of the narrative itself. Of these the first class belongs to the distinctive peculiarities of the Gospel; the second to its general foundation. The one may be supposed to have had no representative in the current Greek tradition; the other to have existed in a Greek form from the first. Exactly in accordance with this supposition it is found that the first class is made up of original renderings of the Hebrew text, while the second is, in the main, in close accordance with the LXX., even where it deviates from the Hebrew. This will appear from an examination of the passages in question:

(i) *Peculiar* quotations: i. 23 (καλέσουσιν); ii. 15, 18; iv. 15, 16; viii. 17; xii. 18 ff.; xiii. 35; xxi. 5; xxvii. 9, 10. Cf. ii. 6.

(ii) *Cyclic* quotations: iii. 3; iv. 4, 6, 7, 10 (προσκυνήσεις); xv. 4, 8, 9; xix. 5 (18 f.); xxi. 42; (xxii. 32); xxii. 39, 44 (ὑποκάτω); xxiii. 39; xxiv. 15; xxvii. 46.

In all these cases (ii) parallels occur in the other Synoptic Gospels agreeing (as St. Matthew) with the LXX. Sometimes, however, quotations in St. Matthew coincide with synoptic parallels, where both differ from the LXX.: xxi. 13; xxvi. 31. In other cases a coincidence with the LXX. is found where the same quotation is not preserved in the context of the Synoptists, though there is evidence that it formed part of the oral narrative: xiii. 14; xi. 10 (cf. Mark i. 2). Cf. ix. 13 = xii. 7 (καὶ οὐ); xxi. 16. Matt. xxii. 24, 37, are quotations of the substance rather than of the words, and differs equally from the LXX. and parallels.

Bleek (quoted by De Wette, *Einl.* § 976) called attention to this difference in the text of St. Matthew's quotations, but did not rightly apprehend its bearing.

2 Heracleon ap. Clem. Al. *Strom.* iv. 9.

3 Matthew, i. e. מַתִּתְיָה = Θεόδωρος.

complete parallel in the corresponding changes in the cases of St. Peter and St. Paul, even if it appear strange that no passing notice of the identification occurs in the catalogues of the Apostles. According to the present text of St. Mark, Levi (Matthew) is called "the son of Alphæus;"[1] and in the absence of any further mark of distinction, it has been usual to identify this Alphæus with the father of James; in which case St. Matthew would have been nearly related by birth to our Lord. His occupation was that of a collector of dues (ὁ τελώνης) on the sea of Galilee; and this alone shows that he cannot have observed the traditions of the Pharisaic school.[2] At a later time he is described as a rigorous ascetic, living "on seeds and fruits and herbs, without flesh,"[3] as if, by a natural reaction, he had exchanged the license of his former life for the sternest self-denial; but this austerity, which was rather that of an Essene than of a Pharisee, appears as part of his practice, and not of his teaching; nor can it have been without influence on the progress of the Christian faith that the Hebrew Evangelist was one who, if it was only on the narrow scene of a Galilæan town, had yet ventured beyond the strict limits of national hope. St. Paul, who was trained in "the straitest sect of his religion," when once convinced, hastened to the opposite pole of truth; St. Matthew, passing to the new faith by a less violent transition, naturally retained a firmer hold on his earlier belief. His apostolic commission tended to strengthen this feeling; for, according to a very early tradition, he remained at Jerusalem with the other Apostles for twelve

1 Mark ii. 14. In this place D and some other MSS. read Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου. The position which St. Matthew occupies in the catalogues of the Apostles throws no light upon this relationship (Matt. x. 3; Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13). In these his connection with Thomas appears to be more clearly marked.

2 Cf. Lange, *Leben Jesu*, i. 238.

3 Clem. Al. *Pæd.* ii. 1. This trait again brings him into connection with James "the Just." Euseb. *H. E.* 22. The same tradition throws some light upon a singular passage quoted from the "Gospel of the Ebionites:" ἦλθον καταλῦσαι τὰς θυσίας, καὶ ἐὰν μὴ παύσησθε τοῦ θύειν οὐ παύσεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἡ ὀργή (Epiph. *Hær.* xxx. 16).

years after the death of the Lord, busy among his own countrymen.[1] When this work was ended, he preached the Gospel "to others;" but no trustworthy authority mentions the scene of his missionary labors, which in later times were popularly placed in "Ethiopia."[2] The mention of his martyrdom is found only in legendary narratives, and is opposed to the best evidence, which represents him to have died a natural death.[3]

These notices, however slight, yet contribute in some measure to mark the fitness of St. Matthew for fulfilling a special part in the representation of the Gospel. The time and place at which he wrote further impress upon his work its distinctive character. The Hebrew Christians, during a succession of fifteen bishops, outwardly observed the customs of their fathers, and for them he was inspired to exhibit in the teaching of Christ the antitypes of the Mosaic Law, to portray the earthly form and theocratic glory of the new dispensation, and to unfold the glorious consummation of "the kingdom of heaven," faintly typified in the history of his countrymen.

St. Mark.

The history of St. Mark is somewhat more distinctly known than that of St. Matthew; but a double name, as in the case of St. Matthew, has given rise to the conjecture that two persons — John Mark,[4] the companion of St. Paul, and Mark the Evangelist

1 *Prædic. Petri* ap. Clem. Al. *Strom.* vi. 5, § 53, μετὰ δώδεκα ἔτη ἐξέλθετε εἰς τὸν κόσμον μή τις εἴπῃ, οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν. This belief was already "a tradition" in the time of Apollonius (c. 180 A. D.): ἔτι δὲ ὡς ἐκ παραδόσεως τὸν σωτῆρα φησὶ προστεταχέναι τοῖς αὐτοῦ ἀποστόλοις ἐπὶ δώδεκα ἔτεσι μὴ χωρισθῆναι τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 18). Cf. Routh, *Rell. Sacr.* i. p. 484.

2 Eusebius says simply (l. c.) when he went ἐφ' ἑτέρους. The later tradition is given by Socrates, *H. E.* i. 19. Cf. Credner, *Einl.* § 35.

3 Heracleon, ap. Clem. Al. *Strom.* iv. 9, § 73. The apocryphal "Acts and Martyrdom of Matthew," which relates, in extravagant terms, his miracles and death in the country of the Anthropophagi, contain no fragment of any genuine tradition, unless it be in the mention of his *Hebrew* prayer (Act. Matt. § 22, p. 182, ed. Tischdf.). The names Ματθαῖος and Ματθίας are constantly confounded: e. g. [Hippol.] *Philos.* vii. 20, where Miller has wrongly introduced Ματθαῖον into the text.

4 Acts xii. 12, Ἰωάννης ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος Μάρκος; xii. 25, Ἰ. τὸν ἐπικληθέντα Μ.; xv, 37, Ἰ. τὸν καλούμενον Μ. Sometimes simply "John:" Acts xiii. 5, 13.

and "son of St. Peter" — are to be distinguished.[1] The general voice of tradition is against this distinction;[2] and the close connection in which St. Peter stood to the former Mark, offers a sufficient explanation of the origin of the title applied to him. When the Apostle was delivered from prison, after the martyrdom of St. James, he went to the house of "Mary the mother of John, surnamed Mark, where many were gathered together." By birth St. Mark was a Jew, and a cousin (ἀνεψιός) of Barnabas, himself a Levite of Cyprus, from which some concluded that St. Mark was of priestly descent.[3] He appears at an early time in connection with Paul and Barnabas, before their special commission to the Gentiles; and when this was given, he accompanied them on their first missionary journey as their "minister" (ὑπηρετής). But after visiting Cyprus, with which he may be supposed to have been previously acquainted, he left them, and returned to Jerusalem, being unprepared, as it would seem, for the more arduous work of the mission.[4] It is perhaps a mark of the same hasty temperament that he was ready, not long

Col. iv. 10, 11.

Acts iv. 36.

Acts xii. 25.

Acts xiii. 5.

Acts xiii. 13; *xv.* 38.

1 The late list of the "seventy disciples" contained in the works of Hippolytus distinguishes *three*, — the Evangelist, the cousin of Barnabas, and John Mark (pp. 953 f. ed. Migne).

The title υἱὸς (1 Pet. v. 13) certainly seems to mark a natural, and not a spiritual, relationship.

2 It must, however, be admitted that the tradition first appears at a later time. It is not, as far as I know, mentioned by Eusebius, or any earlier writer; but occurs first in the preface to the Commentary on St. Mark, which is generally attributed to Victor of Antioch (Cramer, *Cat.* i. p. 263): Μάρκος . . . ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ ὁ Ἰωάννης; and in a note of Ammonius (cf. Cramer, *Cat.* ii. p. 4) on Acts xii. 15, though with some doubt (τάχα οὗτός ἐστι Μάρκος ὁ εὐαγγελιστής . . . πιθανὸν δὲ ὁ λόγος κ. τ. λ.). Yet cf. Hieron. *Comm. in Philem.* 24.

3 *Prol. in Marc.* (Vulg.). Bede, *Prol. in Marc.* ap. Credner, § 48.

4 Chrysost. ap. Cram. *Cat.* in loc. ἅτε ἐπὶ μακροτέραν λοιπὸν στελλομένων ὁδόν. It has been conjectured that the singular epithet "stump-fingered" (κολοβοδάκτυλος), applied to St. Mark in the *Philosophumena* (vii. 30), may refer to this as marking him as a "deserter" (*pollice truncus*, poltroon), the *physical* idea being substituted in the course of time for the *moral* one (Tregelles, *Journ. of Philology*, 1855, pp. 224 ff.).

afterwards, to take part in the second journey of St. Paul; and when St. Paul refused to allow this, in consequence of his former desertion, he went again with Barnabas to Cyprus. The next notice of St. Mark, which occurs after an interval of some years, speaks of steady work and endurance. St. Paul mentions him among those few "fellow-workers who had proved a consolation to him;" and in a contemporary epistle he again names him with St. St. Luke. At a still later period St. Paul desires his help at Rome; and it was at Rome, according to the popular belief, that he specially attached himself to St. Peter; but this belief may have arisen from the opinion, which was common in early times, that St. Peter spoke of Rome under the mystical name of Babylon, though it is more natural to suppose that St. Mark accompanied him on some unrecorded Eastern journey. However this may be, his close connection with St. Peter as his "interpreter" (ἑρμηνευτής, *i. e.*, secretary) is well established;[1] and it was in this relation that he composed his Gospel from the oral teaching of his master.[2] After the death of St. Peter he is said to have visited Alexandria, where he gained, according to the strange notion of later times, the admiration of Philo, and died by martyrdom, according to the common legend.[3]

Acts xv. 36—39.

Col. iv. 10, 11.

Philem. 24.

2 *Tim. iv.* 11.

1 *Pet. v.* 13.

It is, perhaps, a mere fancy, but it seems natural to find in St. Mark a characteristic fitness for his special work.

1 Papias (Johannes Presb.) *ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39 (Μάρκος ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος), Irenæus, *adv. Hær.* iii. 1 (Μ. ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου) Tertullian, *adv. Marc.* iv. 5 (Marcus quod edidit Evangelium Petri affirmatur, cujus interpres Marcus). The sense of ἑρμηνευτής is fixed by Jerome (*ad Hedib.* ii.): Divinorum sensuum majestatem digno non poterat (B. Paulus) Græci eloquii explicare sermone; habebat ergo Titum interpretem, sicut et B. Petrus Marcum, cujus evangelium, Petro narrante et illo scribente, compositum est.

2 Cf. pp. 191 ff.

3 Hieron. *de Vir. Illustr.* 8 (mortuus est octavo Neronis anno). The detailed traditions of his martyrdom are worthless: [Hippol.] l. c. *Chronic. Alex.* ap. Credner, p. 100.

One whose course appears to have been marked throughout by a restless and impetuous energy,[1] was not unsuited for tracing the life of the Lord in the fresh vigor of its outward power. The friend alike of St. Paul and St. Peter, working in turn in each of the great centres of the Jewish world, at first timidly sensitive of danger, and afterwards a comforter of an imprisoned Apostle; himself "of the circumcision," and yet writing to Gentiles,[2] St. Mark stands out as one whom the facts of the Gospel had moved by their simple force to look over and beyond varieties of doctrine in the vivid realization of the actions of "the Son of God." For him, teaching was subordinate to action; and every trait which St. Peter preserved in his narrative would find a faithful recorder in one equally suited to apprehend and to treasure it. The want of personal knowledge was made up by the liveliness of attention with which the Evangelist recorded, "without omission or misrepresentation," the words of his master.[3] The requirements of a Roman audience (πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας [ὁ Πέτρος[4]]) fixed the outlines of the narrative; and the keen memory of a devoted Apostle filled up the picture with details which might well remain in all their freshness on such a mind as his. For St. Peter himself was of a kindred nature with

His connection with St. PETER.

1 This same trait appears even in an early incident of his life, if Townson (followed by Olshausen, Greswell, and Lange) is right in identifying him with "the young man" who followed Jesus at His betrayal with hasty zeal (περιβεβλημένος σινδόνα) and afterwards fled with equal precipitancy (Mark xiv. 51, 52).

Can there also be any basis for the singular tradition which represents him as one of the seventy disciples who was offended by the hard saying of the Lord at Capernaum (John vi. 54), and left Him till brought back by St. Peter? (Epiph. *Hær.* li. 6). The same story occurs in [Hippolytus] (l. c.), but there St. Luke also is joined with him.

2 This follows from the explanation of Jewish customs (ii. 18; vii. 1—4; xiv. 14; xv. 6), opinions (xii. 18), localities (xiii. 3), no less than from the general character of the Gospel.

The idea that the Gospel was originally written in *Latin* (subscriptions to *Syr.* and *Syr. Philox.*, and some MSS. cf. Tischdf. p. 325), was a mere conjecture from the belief that it was "preached" at Rome. The story of the autograph at Venice and Prague is well known, Credner, § 55.

3 Papias, ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39.

4 Papias, *l. c.*

St. Mark. He, too, could recall scenes of inconsiderate zeal and failing faith; while in his later years he still dwelt on each look and word[1] of his heavenly Lord, whom he had early loved with more than a disciple's affection.[2] Thus it was that the master and the disciple were bound together by the closest sympathy. The spirit of the Apostle animates the work of the Evangelist: the spirit of his completed life. For St. Peter's work was already done when he had vanquished at Rome, as before in Palestine, the great Antichrist of the first age;[3] and it remained only that he should be united in martyrdom with St. Paul, with whom he had been before united by the ministry of common disciples, through whom the Apostles of the Jew and Gentile yet speak to all ages.

1 *Pet. v.* 12.
Phil. 24.
2 *Tim. iv.* 11.

St. Luke.

The doubts which attach to the details of the history of St. Matthew and St. Mark recur also in the history of St. Luke.[4] It has been argued from the language of St. Paul that he was of Gentile descent;[5] and in later times he was commonly supposed to

1 A remarkable instance of this occurs in his Epistle (1 Pet. v. 2), ποιμάνατε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, which points significantly to John xxi. 16. The metaphor does not occur in the Pauline Epistles [cf. Eph. iv. 11; Heb. xiii. 20; Acts xx. 28, 29]. In v. 3, τῶν κλήρων should not be translated (as E. V.) *God's* heritage; but the sense is rather: "Be not lords over (Psa. ix. 31, LXX.) those assigned to your *authority*, but ensamples to the flock committed to your love." There is *one* flock, but many *lots;* and thus again we are recalled to John x. 16, in which we are told of one *flock* (ποίμνη) and many *folds* (αὐλή).

2 John xxi. 15 (ἀγαπῶ, φιλῶ).

3 Simon Magus (Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 14). The true historical relation of this "sorcerer" to the apostolic work is too often neglected, though, indeed, it has not yet been sufficiently explained. Cf. *History of N. T. Canon*, pp. 300 ff.

4 The original form of the name *Lucanus* (Λουκᾶς) is preserved in some Latin MSS. (*a, i, ff.2 for.* Cf. Tischdf. pp. 326, 546). Similar contractions occur in Epaphras and Silas.

The identification of Silas with St. Luke, which was proposed by Evanson (*Dissonance*, etc., pp. 106 ff.), and has been lately revived, seems to be inconsistent with the narrative of Acts xvi., and to rest on no sound arguments. The same may be said of the identification of Luke with Lucius, cf. p. 239, n. 5. Such conjectures spring from simple impatience to acquiesce in the fragmentariness of Scripture.

5 Col. iv. 14, 11. The phrase οἱ ὄντες ἐκ περιτομῆς might be used fitly in contrast with a Gentile proselyte; and it was the general opinion in Jerome's time that St. Luke was a proselyte:

have been a native of Antioch,[1] the centre of the Gentile Church, and the birth-place of the Christian name. But this belief, though natural in itself, rests on no conclusive evidence; and the further details which are given as to the mode and place of the Evangelist's conversion,[2] and as to his original social[3] and religious position, can be regarded only as conjectures. So much, however, at least, can be set down with certainty, that he was the friend and companion of St. Paul; and, from a comparison of Col. iv. 14, with Philem. 24, 2 Tim. iv. 10, 11, there remains no reasonable doubt that the Evangelist is the same as "the beloved physician" who continued alone in faithful attendance on the Apostle in his last imprisonment.[4] Nor can the recent theories as to the composition of the Acts be considered to have set aside the natural interpretation of the change of person which marks St. Luke as the companion of St. Paul's second journey. From the narrative it appears that he joined St. Paul at Troas on the eve of his entrance into Macedonia;[5]

Acts xvi. 8—10.

Licet plerique tradant Lucam Evangelistam, ut proselytum, Hebræas litteras ignorasse (Hieron, *Quæst. in Gen.* c. xlvi.). The name seems to have been referred to the Evangelist by all the early commentators: [Ambr.]; Pelagius; Chrysost. *ad loc.*, Adamant. *Dial. c. Marc.* § 1, p. 260, ed. Lomm. Cf. *Can. Murat.* init. Lucas iste medicus. . . . .

1 This is stated first by Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 4, τὸ μὲν γένος ὢν τῶν ἀπ' Ἀντιοχείας), and copied from him by Jerome (*De virr. Illustr.* 7, Antiochensis. *Comm. in Matt.* Præf. natione *Syrus* Antiochensis), and later writers (Theophylact, Euthymius). It is instructive to notice how the tradition grows more definite in time. Chrysostom, on the other hand, while dwelling constantly on the associations of Antioch, takes no notice of such a connection (Lardner, *Credibility*, v. 133).

2 In addition to the tradition of St. Luke's gentile descent and conversion by St. Paul (cf. p. 238 nn.), was another that he was one of the seventy disciples (cf. p. 237, n. 1). This first appears in the *Dialogue against the Marcionites*, appended to Origen's works, and seems from the context to have been suggested by doctrinal reasons (*Dial. c. Marc.* § 1, p. 259, ed. Lomm.). It is repeated by Epiphanius (*Hær.* li. 11, p. 433), with the addition that he preached in Gaul; but Eusebius was unacquainted with the legend. Euseb. *H. E.* i. 12. The identification of St. Luke with one of the two disciples at Emmaus is equally unsupported.

3 The legend that he was an artist, which became very popular in later times, is not found before Nicephorus Callistus (†1450). Lardner, *Credibility*, vi. 112.

4 Cf. p. 238, n. 5.

5 If the reading of D and Augustine (*De Serm. Dom.* ii. 17 (57), in Acts xi.

and when Paul and Silas left Philippi, after their imprisonment, he seems to have remained there, and not to have accompanied St. Paul on his later journeys till after the uproar at Ephesus, when St. Paul met him again at Philippi before his return to Palestine. From this time St. Luke remained in constant attendance (*συνεργός*) on the Apostle, during his journey to Jerusalem, and on his voyage to Rome, where he appears to have remained till the latest period of St. Paul's life. Of the later history of St. Luke nothing is known;[1] but he is generally supposed to have written his Gospel and the Acts in Greece; though even on this point tradition is not uniform.[2]

Acts xvi. 16—40.

Acts xx. 6.

Philem. 24. *Acts xxi.* 1, 17. *Acts xxvii.* 1. 2 *Tim. iv.* 11.

The distinctive characteristic of St. Luke's life lies in the one certain fact of his long companionship with St. Paul. The earliest writers insist on this with uniform and emphatic distinctness.[3] It became a custom to speak of St. Luke as "*the*

His connection with St. Paul.

28 (*συνεστραμμένων δὲ ἡμῶν*), rests on any early tradition, St. Luke would appear to have been in connection with St. Paul at a much earlier period. This reading may perhaps hang together with the identification of St. Luke with *Lucius* of Cyrene (Acts xiii. 1), a notion which was current in Origen's time, unless it is assumed that the Lucius in Rom. xvi. 21, was a different person (Orig. *ad Rom.* xvi. § 39). This identification has found favor among many modern scholars (Lardner, *Credibility*, vi. 124 f.), though it has very little in its favor. On this supposition St. Luke would be a kinsman (*συγγενής*) of St. Paul; a fact which could hardly have failed to be preserved by tradition. Irenæus (*adv. Hær.* iii. 14, 1) points out accurately the companionship of St. Luke with St. Paul, as shown in the Acts.

1 In the absence of all early evidence to the contrary, it may be supposed that he died a natural death. Cf. Lardner, *Credibility*, vi. 129.

2 In Achaiæ Bœotiæque (*alii* Bithyniæque) partibus: Hieron. *Comm. in Matt.* Præf. Compare the various subscriptions given by Tischendorf, p. 546. Some of the copies of the Peshito (Jones, p. 159) place its writing at Alexandria, an opinion which recurs in Ebed Jesu's *Catalogue*, Assem. *Bibl. Orient.* iii. p. 3, probably from a confusion with St. Mark.

The history of the Acts is generally taken to fix the date of the writing of the Gospel, which is supposed to fall shortly before the close of the period of "two years" (Acts xxviii. 30), i. e. before A. D. 63. All that can be certainly affirmed is, that it preceded the Acts (Acts i. 1); for it seems rash to conclude that the Acts necessarily contains the history up to the point of its publication.

3 Cf. pp. 195 f.

brother whose praise in the Gospel is throughout all churches;"[1] and, as soon as the time of Origen, it was supposed that St. Paul spoke in his Epistles of the *written* Gospel of St. Luke, when he referred to that oral teaching which probably itself furnished its substance and character.[2] Such companionship at once bespeaks natural sympathy, and increases it; and whether the allusion to "the beloved physician" points to any special service which St. Luke had rendered to the Apostle, or not, the epithet specially arrests attention in the connection in which it occurs. Nor can it be without influence upon our estimate of St. Luke's character that he wrote the Acts. The very design of such a history, if considered in relation to the Apostolic age, was remarkable; and the form in which it is cast, portraying the development of the Church, "from Jerusalem to Rome," through each stage of its growth, bears witness to a mind in which the future of Christianity was more distinctly imaged even than in the visions of St. John. The book seems in its prophetic fulness to be a true "philosophy of the history" of the Church. It closes only when the Gospel had encountered and conquered a typical cycle of dangers. The universal promulgation and gradual acceptance of the Christian faith is there already prefigured in its critical moments; and the Evangelist who dwelt on such a picture must have been naturally fitted to trace the life of Christ in its wide comprehensiveness, as the Gospel of the nations, full of mercy and hope, assured to a whole world by the love of a suffering Saviour.[3]

2 *Cor. viii.* 18.

Col. iv. 14.

St. John survived to see the outward establishment of

1 E. g. Hieron. *Comm. in Matt.* l. c. Lucus Medicus, natione Syrus Antiochensis, cujus laus in Evangelio, qui et ipse discipulus apostoli Pauli. . . .

2 Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25. Cf. p. 195. On the possible use of some written records of the life of Christ by St. Paul, compare Neander, *Gesch. d. Pflanz.* 131 f.

3 The special inscription to Theophilus (Luke i. 3) may seem to be an objection to this universality of character assigned to St. Luke's Gospel, but really it seems to support it. Theophilus is evidently represented as a man of rank (κράτιστος) and intelligence: and the true scholar (if I may so speak) is essentially the man of the widest sympathies.

that Catholic Church which St. Luke foreshadowed. In him two eras met, so that the mysterious promise of his Master was fulfilled,[1] as he "tarried till the Lord came" in power and judgment, to sweep away the ensigns of the old theocracy, and appear in the Christian body. "The world" might well seem to be "passing away," as the shifting scene in some great tragedy, or rather as the veil which is cast over the Eternal,[2] to one who had passed through the crisis of the first age. He who had anxiously followed Jesus into the judgment-hall, lived to know that His name was preached from India to Spain; he who had frequented the Temple, even after he was filled with the might of Christ, survived its ruin, and died in a city consecrated to the service of a heathen deity; he who would have called fire on the heads of the Samaritans, at last speaks in our ears only the words of love in a Christian assembly.[3] Indeed the differences between St. John and the Synoptists—may we not say between the Son of Thunder and the Christian bishop?—are so striking that they must be reserved for further examination; yet who does not feel that the Apostle "who leaned upon the breast of Jesus,"[4] was naturally most qualified

St. John.

John xviii. 15.

Acts xix. 35.

Luke ix. 54.

John xiii. 25, xxi. 20.

1 John xxi. 22, Ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν ἕως ἔρχομαι, τί πρὸς σέ; The stress lies on the idea of an extended interval (ἕως ἔρχομαι [1 Tim. iv. 13, Vulg. *dum venio*], *donec venio*, as *Cod. Fuld.* in v. 23, and Aug. once, iii. 2466 D.), and not an indefinite and single limit (ἕως ἂν ἔλθω. Vulg. *quoad usque veniat*, 1 Cor. iv. 5). The famous legend of St. John's grave at Ephesus is well told by Augustine, *Tract. in Joh.* cxxiv. 2.

2 1 John ii. 17, ὁ κόσμος παράγεται compared with 1 Cor. vii. 31, παράγει τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου. The double change appears to be significant. For the image of παράγεσθαι compare 1 John ii. 8, and perhaps App. *Mithr.* 117, etc. θρίαμβον παράγειν.

3 Jerome (*Comm. in Ep. ad Galat.* Lib. iii. vi. 10, p. 528) gives the noble story, which cannot be too often quoted. It is remarkable that it is not found in any earlier writer.

4 Augustine has a long and eloquent passage on the active and contemplative lives which he finds symbolized in St. Peter and St. John, *Tract. in Joh.* cxxiv. 5, which he briefly sums up: Perfecta me sequatur actio, informata meæ passionis exemplo; inchoata vero contemplatio manent donec venio, complenda cum venero.

to record the deepest mysteries of His doctrines? that he to whom the mother of the Lord was entrusted was most fitted to guard "the inheritance of the universe?" that he who had outlived the first earthly forms in which Christianity was clothed must have been able to see most clearly, and set forth most fully, its unchanging essence, "as he soared like an eagle above the clouds of human infirmity, and contemplated with keen and steady gaze the light of eternal truth."[1]

The general result of the position of the Evangelists.

Without exaggerating the importance of such details of the lives of the Evangelists as have been just collected, it may be said that, as far as they throw any light upon their character and position, they show them to have represented different types of Christian doctrine, and to have written under circumstances favorable for the expression of their distinctive views. The places at which the Gospels were probably written — Judæa, Italy, Greece, Asia, — and the persons for whom they were immediately designed, harmonize with what may be regarded as the individual bias of the writers. So far as any likelihood exists that each Gospel will bear the marks of personal feeling and outward influence, this individuality is seen to be no accidental admixture of a human element, by which the divine truth was marred,

1 August. *De Cons. Ev.* i. 6, 9. Cf. *Tract. in Joh.* xxxvi. 5. Restat aquila: ipse est Joannes, sublimium prædicator, et lucis internæ atque æternæ fixis oculis contemplator. By the side of these passages must be placed another, not less true nor less needful to be remembered: Audeo dicere fratres mei, forsitan nec ipse Joannes dixit ut est, sed ut ipse potuit; quia de Deo homo dixit: et quidem inspiratus a Deo, sed tamen homo. Quia inspiratus, dixit aliquid; si non inspiratus esset, dixisset nihil: quia vero homo inspiratus, non totum quod est dixit; sed quod potuit homo, dixit (*Tract. in Joh.* i. 1). The whole context, in spite of the strangeness of the imagery, is well worthy of study.

Early tradition is uniform in representing the Gospel as written at Ephesus: Iren. *adv. Hær.* ii. 1; Hieron. *De virr. Illustr.* 9. Cf. *Can. Murat. sub. init.* Compare also the subscriptions of the Oriental versions, Tischdf. *N. T.* p. 696. The notion that it was written at Patmos seems to rest on the unsupported statement of Pseudo-Hippol. *De XII Apost.* p. 952.

The date at which it was written cannot be determined with accuracy. The earliest writers, rightly, I believe, place it last in time: [*Can. Murat.*]; Iren. l. c.; Clem. Alex. ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14; [Orig. ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25] Jerome, l. c.

but, on the contrary, a trace of the working of God's Spirit, by which such persons were moved to write as would best represent to the Church the manifold forms of the life of Christ. We may detect in every picture of the Saviour the unchanging Deity; but at the same time the Absolute, so to speak, is clothed in each case with special attributes, which are determined by the sacred writers as they dwelt on the several sides of Christ's human nature. Each gives a true image, but not a complete one; and if in old times Messiah was variously represented as the second Lawgiver, the mighty King, and the great High Priest, we need feel no wonder that three Evangelists portrayed His presence in the fashion of a man, while the fourth revealed that crowning doctrine of the Christian faith, which, if it existed in the depths of the ancient Scriptures, had been unobserved by the Jew.[1] The same Spirit worked in all, — the Spirit of wisdom and knowledge, of practical and spiritual judgment, — and enabled them to find the perfected tendency and plenary development of their own hopes and energies in the teaching and life of Him in whom all the powers of man were united with the fulness of the Godhead.

2. The distinctness of the Gospels attested by (a) The practice of separate sects.

The reality of the distinctive characteristics of the Gospels will appear yet more clearly, if we consider their relation to the different sects which exhibited the exclusive development of the several elements which the Catholic Church recognized and united in her teaching.[2] It has been seen that variety of feeling existed even in the apostolic body;[3] and when this was reproduced in the Christian society, it soon gave rise to those "divisions" which lie at the bottom of the great parties into which Christendom has been since severed. One said, "I am of Paul;" and another, "I am of Apollos;" and another, "I

1 Just. Mart. *Dial c. Tryph.* § 49, p. 268 A.

2 The chief fragments of the "Apocryphal" Gospels noticed in the following paragraph in connection with various sects, will be given in App. D.

3 Pp. 223 ff.

am of Cephas;" and another, "I am of Christ;"[1] when the first tidings of the Gospel had hardly died away on their ears.[2] The inward tendency had already become a conscious feeling, and was rapidly hastening towards a dogmatic decision. Men were no longer content to find that for which they were seeking in the life of Christ; they wished to isolate it. The logical exhibition of Christianity, its mystic depths, its outward and ritual aspect, its historic power, were thus separated and substituted for its complex essence; just as the Sadducee, the Essene, the Pharisee, and the Herodian, had already found in the Law a basis for their discordant and exclusive systems.[3] Yet it would be an anachronism to suppose that the Corinthian Church exhibited at once definite and circumscribed parties. The spirit of party was not immediately embodied; but in the course of time the fundamental differences which it represented were boldly and clearly systematized. Some were not content to cherish the ancient Law with natural reverence and pride (*Nazarenes*), but insisted on the universal reception of the Mosaic ritual (*Ebionites*). They saw in Jesus nothing but the human Messiah, coördinate with Adam and Moses,[4] and in the Christian faith

EBIONITES. (*St. Matthew.*)

1 It is worthy of notice that the phrase is ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ, and not ἐγὼ δὲ Ἰησοῦ. The personal name, which is universal in the Gospels and common in the Acts and the Apocalypse, is naturally rare in the Epistles, unless the human nature of the Lord requires to be brought into clear prominence. Cf. 2 Cor. iv. 5, 10, 11; Hebr. ii. 9; xii. 24, and often.

2 1 Cor. i. 12. Cf. Neander, *Gesch. d. Pflanz.* 324 ff. After all that has been written on "the Christ-party," I still believe that the words of St. Paul refer to those who preferred to cling to Christ alone, without accepting the Christian doctrine mediately through the Apostles. The present century has seen such a sect formed in America. It is impossible not to feel that the many essays on these "parties" are conceived wholly in the spirit of our own time, without any realization of the life of the first age.

3 Cf. Neander, *Church History*, i. 52 ff.

4 Cf. *Clem. Hom.* iii. 21 (Adam); ii. 38 (Moses). Cf. Hom. iii. 20; xviii. 13; and iii. 20, [ὁ ὑπὸ χειρῶν θεοῦ κυοφορηθεὶς ἄνθρωπος] ὃς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αἰῶνος ἅμα τοῖς ὀνόμασιν μορφὰς ἀλλάσσων τὸν αἰῶνα τρέχει, μέχρις ὅτε ἰδίων χρόνων τυχών, διὰ τοὺς καμάτους θεοῦ ἐλέει χρισθεὶς, εἰσαεὶ ἕξει τὴν ἀνάπαυσιν. Cf. Uhlhorn, *Die Hom. u. Recogn. d. Clem. Rom.* 164 ff.

nothing but the perfection of Judaism,[1] whether they regarded this from the practical (*Ebionites* proper) or mystical point of sight (*Gnostic Ebionites.*[2]) St. Paul was emphatically "their enemy," and the universal Gospel which he preached "a lawless and idle doctrine."[3] By the common consent of early witnesses, the various sects which arose from the embodiment of these principles agreed in taking the "Gospel" of St. Matthew as the basis of their evangelic record. This appears to have existed among the Nazarenes in a comparatively pure Hebrew (Aramaic) form; and even in Jerome's time the copy which they used preserved a very clear resemblance to the Canonical Gospel, differing chiefly by interpolations, which were rendered at once easy and natural from the isolation of the Jewish Christians.[4] The two other parties included under the common title of *Ebionites* seem to have preserved peculiar Greek recensions of the same fundamental narrative. The Ebionites in a stricter sense had nothing in their Gospel to answer to the first two chapters of our present text, and Epiphanius describes the book generally as "incomplete, adulterated and mutilated."[5] The fragments which he quotes point also the further conclusion that it was de-

1 Either as identifying Christianity with the real essence of Judaism (the *Homilies*); or as recognizing in Judaism the preparation for Christianity (the *Recognitions*). Cf. Uhlhorn, *a. a. O.* 258 ff.

2 On the twofold distinction in relation to the Person of Christ, see Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 27 (vi. 17); Epiph. *Hær.* xxx. 16.

3 *Ep. Petri* [*Hom. Clem.*) c. 2. τινὲς γὰρ τῶν ἀπὸ ἐθνῶν τὸ δι' ἐμοῦ νόμιμον ἀπεδοκίμασαν κήρυγμα, τοῦ ἐχθροῦ ἀνθρώπου ἄνομόν τινα καὶ φλυαρώδη προσηκάμενοι διδασκαλίαν, καὶ ταῦτα ἔτι μου περιόντος ἐπεχείρησάν τινες ποικίλαις τισὶν ἑρμηνείαις τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους μετασχηματίζειν εἰς τὴν τοῦ νόμου κατάλυσιν, ὡς καὶ ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ οὕτω μὲν φρονοῦντος μὴ ἐκ παῤῥησίας δὲ κηρύσσοντος· ὅπερ ἀπείη. The whole passage is most instructive, and the allusion to Gal. ii. 12, ὑπέστελλεν καὶ ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτὸν κ. τ. λ. unmistakable. Compare also *Hom.* xvii. 19, where St. Paul is assailed under the person of Simon Magus, with a verbal reference to Gal. ii. 11 (εἰ κατεγνωσμένον με λέγεις).

4 Cf. Hieron. *ad. Matt.* xii. 13; *De virr. Illustr.* 3.

5 Epiph. *Hær.* xxx. 13, οὐχ ὅλον πληρέστατον ἀλλὰ νενοθευμένον καὶ ἠκρωτηριασμένον. On the other hand, the Nazarenes ἔχουσι τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον πληρέστατον· Εβραϊστί (*Hær.* xxix. 9), though Epiphanius, in the next sentence, says that he does not know whether "they removed the genealogy." Yet cf. *Hær.* xxx. 14.

rived from the Aramaic, and not from the Greek text. But it was otherwise with the Gnostic-Ebionite Gospel. The text of this[1] presents the most constant coincidence with the language of the Greek St. Matthew, and it can hardly have been derived from any other source. The variations which it presents are generally such as admit of explanation from polemical motives, and where it is not so, allowance must still be made for freedom of quotation, and for the influence of tradition.[2] One fact, however, is clearly prominent throughout these intelligible varieties of recension, that the Gospel of St. Matthew was felt to be distinctively the Jewish Gospel. The life of the second Lawgiver was the common foundation which Judaizing Christians of every shade of opinion used for the construction of their distinctive records.

DOCETÆ. *(St. Mark.)*

The special history of the Gospel of St. Mark is more obscure. Even at the beginning of the fifth century no distinct commentary upon it was yet written.[3] The "preaching of Peter," which enjoyed a wide popularity in the second and third centuries, has nothing but the name in common with St. Mark;[4] and the accounts of "the Gospel according to Peter" are so meagre that no satisfactory conclusion can be drawn as to its origin and characteristics.[5] Yet there is one clear and decided statement that some sectarians paid a peculiar regard to the Gospel of St. Mark. After noticing the exclusive reverence which the Ebionites and Marcionites paid respectively to the Gospels of St. Matthew and

1 As gathered specially from the *Clementines*.

2 Passages occur which show clearly that the writer of the Homilies was acquainted with the contents of the three other canonical Gospels. Cf. *Canon of N. T.* p. 317.

3 Cramer, *Cat. in Marc.* Hypoth. p. 263 (*Victor Ant.*).

4 See particularly the passages quoted by Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* vi. 5. It is, however, worthy of notice that St. Peter is represented as urging his hearers in the same terms to avoid the Pagan and Jewish forms of worship. Cf Credner, *Beiträge*, i. 351 ff. Schwegler, *Nachapost. Zeit.* ii. 30 ff.

5 Cf. Serapion, ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 12. Routh, *Rell. Sacr.* i. pp. 452 ff. Serapion connects the Gospel with Marcianus (? Marcus) and the Docetæ.

St. Luke, Irenæus adds that those who separated Jesus from Christ, — the human instrument from the divine Spirit, — maintaining that Jesus suffered, while Christ continued always impassible, preferred the Gospel according to St. Mark.[1] It might seem that they dwelt more particularly on the works of Messiah's power, and not on the mystery of His incarnation; and found their Gospel in the recital of miracles and mighty acts, which bore the impress of God, rather than in words and discourses which might seem like those of man.

MARCIONITES. (*St. Luke.*)

It has been seen that the Gospel of St. Matthew underwent several recensions. The developments of the Judaizing tendency were various, for it was the spirit of a people and not of an individual. But the doctrine of St. Paul, which bore the clear image of one mind, was made the basis of a single marked system. In the first half of the second century, Marcion, the son of a Bishop of Sinope,[2] gave his name and talents to a sect which proposed to hold the perfected doctrines of the Gentile Apostle. So far from finding any right of perpetuity in the Jewish Law, he ascribed its origin to the Demiurge, from whose evil rule men were set free by the Saviour. In Christianity, according to his view, all was sudden and unprepared:[3] a new and spiritual religion was revealed immediately from heaven to supplant the earthly kingdom which had been pro-

1 Iren. *adv. Hær.* iii. 11, 7. Qui autem Jesum separant a Christo, et impassibilem perseverasse Christum, passum vero Jesum dicunt, id quod secundum Marcum est præferentes Evangelium, cum amore veritatis legentes illud corrigi possunt. Olshausen (*Echth. d. Evang.* 97) rejects this statement, but without sufficient ground. The description which Irenæus gives agrees with a form of Docetism which (cf. p. 247 n. 4) was actually connected with the Gospel according to Peter. Cf. [Hippol.] *adv. Hær.* viii. 10, p. 267.

2 Epiph. *Hær.* xlii. 1 [Tertull.] *de Præscr. Hær.* li. The statement, however, has been doubted, for Tertullian takes no notice of it. The writer under the name of Tertullian attributes to Cerdo the Canon which is elsewhere assigned to Marcion.

3 Tertull. *adv. Marc.* iv. 11; Subito Christus; subito et Johannes. Sic sunt omnia apud Marcionem, quæ suum et plenum ordinem habent apud creatorem. Cf. iii. 6.

mised to the people of Israel by their God. As a necessary consequence of his principles, Marcion could not accept the Catholic Canon of the Scriptures, but formed a new one suited to the limits of his belief. His "Apostolicon" was confined to ten Epistles of St. Paul, and his Gospel was a mutilated recension of St. Luke.[1] For him the Pauline narrative was the truest picture of the life of Christ, though even this required to be modified by a process which was easily practicable at a time when the Evangelic text was not yet fixed beyond the influence of tradition.

The VALENTINIANS. *(St. John.)*

The peculiar characteristics of St. John's Gospel could not fail to attract some of the early mystic schools. The deep significance of its language, the symbolic use of the words "light" and "darkness," "life" and "death," "the world," "the word," and "the truth," furnished the Eastern speculator with a foundation for his favorite theories. If we may trust Irenæus,[2] the terminology of the Valentinians was chiefly derived from that of St. John; and, conversely, in recent times many have supposed that the Gospel itself was due to Gnostic sources. The affinity which it has with part of the Gnostic scheme is at least undoubted; and Heracleon, the most famous scholar of Valentinus, wrote the first commentary upon it,[3] following, according to Tertullian, his master's example, in using "the pen instead of the knife to bring the Scriptures into agreement with his tenets."[4]

This severance of the Gospel-histories by different sects exhibits most distinctly the reality and nature of their difference. For if they have no special character, on what hypothesis can we explain their connection with partial

1 After long discussion even the Tübingen critics appear to have acquiesced in the belief that the Gospel of St. Luke is the original document (Herzog, *Encyclop.* s. v.). Cf. *Hist. of N. T. Canon*, 351 f.

2 Iren. *adv. Hær.* i. 8, 5: πατέρα γὰρ εἴρηκεν [ὁ Ἰωάννης] καὶ Χάριν καὶ Μονογενῆ καὶ Ἀλήθειαν καὶ Λόγον καὶ Ζωὴν καὶ Ἄνθρωπον καὶ Ἐκκλησίαν.

3 Cf. Orig. *in Joh.* x. § 21. *Hist. of N. T. Canon*, 334 ff.

4 Tertull. *de Præscr. Hær.* 38.

exhibitions of Christian truth? How were the separate books adopted by peculiar schools, which pursued to an excess the idea which we have supposed to predominate in them? Those who admitted only one Gospel, even if they mutilated and altered it, must have found in it some peculiar points of contact with their own position; and rightly found them, for heresy is but the inordinate desire to define, distinguish, and isolate those manifold elements which are combined in the perfect truth.

(b) The judgment of the Church.

Sectaries divided the Gospels as being separately complete; the Church united them, as constituents of a harmonious whole. The first distinct recognition of the *four* Gospels presents them also as *one*. "The Creator Word, who sits upon the Cherubim, when manifested to men, gave us the Gospel in a fourfold form, while it is held together by one Spirit;" and in the same place Irenæus labors to prove, by various analogies, that the Gospels could not be more or fewer than four, the number of the faces of the Cherubim, which were "images of the life and work of the Son of God."[1] The same mysterious emblem of Ezekiel was constantly applied to the Evangelists in later times throughout the Christian world, but generally as modified in the Apocalypse, where the idea of individual life prevails over that of a common being. Yet, while the early fathers agreed in the general explanation of the vision, they differed widely in details.[2]

The Evangelic symbols.

1 Iren. *adv. Hær.* iii. 11, 8: ὁ τῶν ἁπάντων τεχνίτης λόγος, ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῶν Χερουβὶμ καὶ συνέχων τὰ πάντα, φανερωθεὶς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τετράμορφον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἑνὶ δὲ πνεύματι συνεχόμενον . . . καὶ γὰρ τὰ Χερουβὶμ τετραπρόσωπα· καὶ γὰρ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν εἰκόνες τῆς πραγματείας τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

2 Irenæus (l. c.) regarding, as Augustine remarks (*De Cons. Ev.* i. 9 [6]), only the commencement, and not the scope, of the books, assigns the "*man*" to St. Matthew, the "*eagle*" to St. Mark, the "*lion*" to St. John, and the "*ox*" to St. Luke. This opinion is repeated by Juvencus, *Ev. Hist.* Præf. The opinion of Jerome is followed by Ambrose (*in Luc.* Præf. §§ 7, 8; cf. *Comm. in Luc.* x. 117, 118); Sedulius, *Carm. Pasch.* i. 355 ff., and generally in later times. All writers agree in assigning the "ox" to St. Luke.

In the West, the interpretation of Jerome gained almost universal currency, and in later times he has been confirmed by the usage of art.[1] According to this the "man" is assigned to St. Matthew, the "lion" to St. Mark, the "ox" to St. Luke, and the "eagle" to St. John, as typifying respectively the human, active, sacrificial, and spiritual sides of the Gospel. Augustine, who inverts the order of the first two symbols, and probably with justice, agrees with Jerome in drawing a line between the creatures of the earth and of the sky;[2] and a trace of this distinction is found at a still earlier period. Clement of Alexandria relates it as a current tradition in his time, that "St. John, when he found in the writings of the other Evangelists the bodily history of the Lord, composed a spiritual Gospel,"[3] and such language is not an inapt description of the relation of the Synoptists to St. John.

The Essay of St. Augustine.

But though the early Church apprehended with distinctness the characteristics of the Gospels, Augustine seems to have been the first who endeavored to explain their minute differences by a reference to their general aim; and his work is better in conception than in execution. The age was hardly ripe for the task; and Augustine had not the critical tact for performing it. The mass of Christians too gladly welcomed the inspired histories on their apostolic claims to submit their composition and arrangement to internal scrutiny. It was enough for them that they were written by holy men of God, without attempting to determine their mutual relations. And even the scholars among them were better qualified to discuss the manifold bearings of an isolated passage, than to form a general idea of the

1 These emblems of the Evangelists are not, however, found before the Mosaics of the 15th century (Münter, *Sinnbilder d. Alten Christen*, i. pp. 44 ff.). The earliest symbols are four rolls round a representation of the feeding of the 4000 (Münter, i. 44, Pl. 13.) Afterwards they appear as four streams issuing from a rock, on which Christ, or the Lamb, or the Cross, stands (cf. Cypr. *Ep.* 73, 10).

2 Hieron. *in Ezek.* i. 7 ff. Aug. *De Cons. Ev.* l. c.

3 Clem. Al. *ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14.

historic features of a whole book. On the other hand, we must remember that a rich inheritance of tradition was treasured up in the early Church; and the attempt of Augustine, combined with the general statements of former writers, sufficiently shows the method in which these would have sought for an explanation of the variations of the Evangelists. His essay is the formal expression of their silently-recognized belief.

The consequences of this view of the Gospels.

The view which has just been sketched of the relation of the canonical Gospels to the varieties of opinion existing in the apostolic age, and to the great principles from which they spring, which are as permanent as human nature itself, suggest necessarily various reflections as to their relation to ourselves. Above all, it will remove that dead conception of a verbal harmony between them which is fatal to their true understanding. Their real harmony is essentially moral, and not mechanical. It is not to be found in an ingenious mosaic, composed of their disjointed fragments, but in the contemplation of each narrative from its proper point of sight. The threefold portrait of Charles I. which Vandyke prepared for the sculptor is an emblem of the work of the first Evangelists: the complete outward shape is fashioned, and then, at last, another kindles the figure with a spiritual life. Nor are the separate portraitures less pregnant with instruction than when they were originally drawn. If we study the records in their simple individuality, forgetting for the time the other traits which fill up the picture, we shall probably find more in this view of their distinctness than a mere speculation; it will show us the life of Christ in relation to the master-spirit of our own constitution. The Gospel will be seen to be particular, as well as universal. We shall gain a conception of the multiform aspects of Christianity in the many-sided presence of its Founder. We shall see its manifoldness, as well as its unity. We shall no longer regard it as a philosophic ideal of religion, but as a living revelation, devel-

oped and perfected among *men*. We shall recall the period when the several Gospels satisfied the various moral and spiritual wants which must remain the same to the end of time, and trace the divine sanction which they give to the different tendencies of human thought and action. We shall rise upwards from the perception of individuality to that of variety; from variety to catholicity. The various outward forms of Evangelic teaching, recognized by the Apostles and ratified by the Church, will teach us to look for some higher harmony in faith than simple unison. We shall acknowledge that it is now as in days of old, when the same unchanging scheme of redemption proceeding from one God, "seeking the weal of men through divers ways by one Lord," was seen under changeful varieties of external shape.[1] The lesson of experience and history, the lesson of reason and life, will be found written on the very titles of the Gospels, where we shall read with growing hope and love that "God fulfils Himself in many ways."

1 Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 13, § 106: μία γὰρ τῷ ὄντι διαθήκη ἡ σωτήριος ἀπὸ μεταβολῆς κόσμου εἰς ἡμᾶς διήκουσα κατὰ διαφόρους γενέας τε καὶ χρόνους διάφορος εἶναι τὴν δόσιν ὑποληφθεῖσα. ἀκόλουθον γὰρ εἶναι μίαν ἀμετάθετον σωτηρίας δόσιν παρ' ἑνὸς Θεοῦ δι' ἑνὸς κυρίου πολυτρόπως ὠφελοῦσαν. . . . Cf. Lib. vii. 17, § 107.

CHAPTER V.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN.

> Two worlds are ours: 't is only Sin
> Forbids us to descry
> The mystic heaven and earth within,
> Plain as the sea and sky. — KEBLE.

The general contrast between St. John and the Synoptists.

IT is impossible to pass from the Synoptic Gospels to that of St. John without feeling that the transition involves the passage from one world of thought to another. No familiarity with the general teaching of the Gospels, no wide conception of the character of the Saviour, is sufficient to destroy the contrast which exists in form and spirit between the earlier and later narratives; and a full recognition of this contrast is the first requisite for the understanding of their essential harmony. The Synoptic Gospels contain the Gospel of the infant Church; that of St. John the Gospel of its maturity. The first combine to give the wide experience of the many; the last embraces the deep mysteries treasured up by the one. All alike are consciously based on the same great facts; but yet it is possible, in a more limited sense, to describe the first as historical, and the last as ideal; though the history necessarily points to truths which lie beyond all human experience, and the "ideas" only connect that which was once for all realized on earth with the eternal of which it was the revelation. This broad distinction renders it necessary to notice several points in the Gospel of St. John, both in

itself and in its relation to the Synoptic Gospels, which seem to be of the greatest importance towards the right study of it. No writing, perhaps, if we view it simply as a writing, combines greater simplicity with more profound depths. At first all seems clear in the child-like language which is so often the chosen vehicle of the treasures of Eastern meditation; and then again the utmost subtlety of Western thought is found to lie under abrupt and apparently fragmentary utterances. The combination was as natural in the case of St. John, as it was needful to complete the cycle of the Gospels. The special character of the Gospel was at once the result and the cause of its special history; and when we have gained a general conception of the Gospel in itself, the relations of difference or agreement in which it stands to the other narratives will at once become intelligible.

Characteristics of St. John.

The facts bearing on the life of St. John which are recorded in the Gospels are soon told. He was the son, apparently the younger son,[1] of Zebedee and Salome.[2] His father was a Galilæan fisherman, sufficiently prosperous to have hired servants,[3] and, at a later time, his mother was one of the women who followed the Lord, and "ministered to Him of their substance."[4] Nothing is recorded which throws any light upon the character of Zebedee, except the simple fact that he interposed no

I. The Gospel in itself.

1. Its history.

(a) The life of St. John.

1 That he was the younger son appears to follow from the order in which the names "James and John the brother of James" are generally given in the Gospels; Matt. iv. 21, etc.; Mark i. 21, etc.; Luke v. 10, etc. The names occur in the other order, "Peter, John, and James," in Luke viii. 51; ix. 28, though the reading is doubtful. In Acts xii. 2, James is styled "the brother of John."

2 Mark xv. 40; xvi. 1, compared with Matt. xxvii. 56. From the comparison of the last passage with John xix. 26, it has been concluded that Salome was the sister of "the mother of the Lord," but the interpretation of the passage is uncertain. Later traditions suppose various other relationships between the families of Joseph and Mary and Zebedee. Cf. Winer, RWB. *Salome;* Thilo, *Cod. Apocr.* 362 ff.

3 Mark i. 20. Cf. John xix. 27.

4 Mark xvi. 1, compared with Luke viii. 3.

obstacle to his sons' apostleship; but Salome herself went with Christ even to His death, and the very greatness of her request[1] is the sign of a faith living and fervent, however unchastened. St. John, influenced it may be by his mother's hopes, and sharing them, although "simple and unlettered,"[2] first attached himself to the Baptist, and was one of those to whom Jesus was revealed by him as "the Lamb of God."[3] Henceforth he accompanied his new Master, and, together with his brother and St. Peter, was admitted into a closer relationship with Him than the other Apostles.[4] In this nearer connection St. John was still nearest,[5] and as he followed Christ to judgment and death,[6] he received from the Cross the charge to receive the mother of the Lord as her own son.[7] After the Ascension St. John remained at Jerusalem with the other Apostles. He was with St. Peter at the working of his first miracle; and afterwards he went with him to Samaria.[8] At the time of St. Paul's first visit to Jerusalem he was absent from the city; but on a later occasion St. Paul describes him as one of "the pillars of the Church."[9] At what time, and under what circumstances, he left Jerusalem is wholly unknown; but tradition is unanimous in placing the scene of his after-labors at Ephesus.[10] His residence there must have taken place after St. Paul's departure, but this is all that can be affirmed with certainty. It is generally agreed that he was banished to Patmos during his stay at Ephesus, but the time of his exile is very variously given.[11] The legend of his sufferings at Rome, which was

1 Matt. xx. 20 ff. Cf. Mark x. 35 ff. The same characteristic appears under a different form in the wish of her two sons, Luke ix. 54; and in spite of other interpretations, it is best to refer the surname, *Boanerges* (Mark iii. 16), which is applied to them, to a natural warmth of temperament.

2 Acts iv. 13.

3 John i. 35 ff.

4 Luke viii. 51 (at the house of Jairus); ix. 28 (at the Transfiguration); Mark xiv. 33 (at Gethsemane).

5 John xiii. 23; xxi. 7, 20 (μ. ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς).

6 John xviii. 15; xix. 26.

7 John xix. 27.

8 Acts i. 13; iii. 1 ff.; viii. 14.

9 Gal. i. 18 ff.; ii. 9.

10 Iren. *adv. Hær.* iii. 1, 1.

11 Iren. v. 30, 3 (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 8) (*Domitian*); Epiph. *Hær.* 51, 33 (*Claudius*).

soon embellished and widely circulated, is quite untrustworthy;[1] and the details of his death at Ephesus are equally fabulous, though it is allowed on all hands that he lived to extreme old age.[2]

Later legends.

But while no sufficient materials remain for constructing a life of the Apostle, the most authentic traditions which are connected with his name contribute something to the distinctness of his portraiture.[3] The lessons of his Epistles and Gospel are embodied in legends which characterize him as the zealous champion of purity of faith and practice within the Christian body, and in one legend, at least, the symbolism of the Jewish dispensation is transferred to the service of Christianity, as in the visions of the Apocalypse. On the one hand St. John proclaims with startling severity the claims of doctrinal truth,[4] and the duties of the teacher;[5] on the other he stands out in the majesty of a sacred office, clothed in something of the dress of the old theocracy.[6] The two views involve no contradiction, but rather exhibit the wide range of that divine love which cherishes every element of truth with the most watchful care, because it is of infinite moment for the well-being of man. The associ-

1 Tertull. *de Præscr. Hær.* 36: . . . . in oleum igneum demersus nihil passus est. Hieron. *ad Matt.* xx. 23.

2 Iren. ii. 22, 5: μέχρι τῶν Τραϊάνου χρόνων. Hieron. *ad Galat.* vi. 10. For the traditions which describe him as still living in his tomb at Ephesus, compare Credner, *Einl.* 220 f. The passage of Augustine (*In Ev. Johann. Tract.* 124, 2) is perhaps the most interesting notice of the belief.

3 These traditions have been collected and discussed by Stanley, *Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age*, pp. 275 ff.

4 Iren. iii. 3, 4 (on the authority of Polycarp. Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 14) . . . . Ἰωάννης, ὁ τοῦ κυρίου μαθητής, ἐν τῇ Ἐφέσῳ πορευθεὶς λούσασθαι καὶ ἰδὼν ἔσω Κήρινθον, ἐξήλατο τοῦ βαλανείου μὴ λουσάμενος ἀλλ' ἐπειπών· Φύγωμεν, μὴ καὶ τὸ βαλανεῖον συμπέσῃ, ἔνδον ὄντος Κηρίνθου, τοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐχθροῦ. Cf. Epiph. *Hær.* xxx. 24, where a similar legend is told of St. John and "Ebion."

5 In the beautiful story of the young Robber — μῦθος οὐ μῦθος — which is too long to quote: Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 23 (on the authority of Clement of Alexandria).

6 Polycrates, *ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 31 (v. 24): ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ κυρίου ἀναπεσών, ὃς ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον πεφορεκὼς καὶ μάρτυς καὶ διδάσκαλος οὗτος ἐν Ἐφέσῳ κεκοίμηται. For the use of τὸ πέταλον compare Ex. xxviii. 32; xxix. 6; Levit. viii. 9 (LXX.). Cf. Bingham, *Antiquities*, ii. 9, § 5.

ations of the past are not rudely cast aside when they can no longer betray. To a Christian among Christians the perils and supports of faith appear in new lights; and the one famous phrase, "Little children, love one another," becomes a complete rule of life, when it is based upon the perception of Christian brotherhood and received as the charge of a father in Christ.[1] As compared with the other representative Apostles, — St. Peter, St. James, and St. Paul, — the position of St. John is clearly marked. He belongs rather to the history of the Church, if the distinction may be drawn, than to the history of the Apostles, and is the living link which unites the two great ages. He is the guardian of a faith already established, and not, like St. Peter, the founder of an outward Church. His antagonist is Cerinthus, the founder of a false representation of Christianity, and not Simon Magus, who appears in the position of an Antichrist. In his teaching "the faith" is contemplated in its fundamental facts, which include all there is of special application in the reasoning of St. Paul and in the prophetic exhortations of St. James. In the language of the last chapter of his Gospel, which itself is the meeting-point of inspiration and tradition, he "abode till the Lord came," and speaks in the presence of a Catholic Church, which rose out of the conflicts which had been guided to the noblest issue by the labors of those who preceded him.

The typical character of St. John.

This last chapter of his Gospel is in every way a most remarkable testimony to the influence of St. John's person and writings. Differences of language,[2] no less than the abruptness of

(b) The authenticity of the Gospel.

1 Hieron. *Comm. in Ep. ad Galat.* vi. 10; Beatus Joannes Evangelista cum Ephesi moraretur usque ad ultimam senectutem et vix inter discipulorum manus ad ecclesiam deponetur, nec possit in plura vocem verba contexere, nihil aliud per singulas solebat proferre collectas, nisi hoc: Filioli, diligite alterutrum. Tandem discipuli et patres qui aderant, tædio affecti quod eadem semper audirent, dixerunt: Magister quare semper hoc loqueris? Qui respondit dignam Joanne sententiam: Quia præceptum Domini est, et si solum fiat, sufficit.

2 Yet these differences by no means

its introduction and its substance, seem to mark it clearly as an addition to the original narrative; and the universal concurrence of all outward evidence no less certainly establishes its claim to a place in the canonical book. It is a ratification of the Gospel, and yet from the lips of him who wrote it; it allows time for the circulation of a wide-spread error, and yet corrects the error by the authoritative explanation of its origin. The testimony, though upon the extreme verge of the Apostolic period, yet falls within it, and the Apostle, in the consciousness (as it seems) of approaching death, confirms again his earlier record, and corrects the mistaken notion which might have cast doubt upon the words of the Lord.[1]

The testimony of the last chapter.

The earliest account of the origin of the Gospel is already legendary,[2] but the mention which it contains of a subsequent revision may rest upon the facts which are seen to be indicated by the concluding chapter. So much, however, is attested by competent authority, that St. John composed his Gospel at a later time than the other Evangelists;[3] and it can scarcely be wrong to refer the book to the last quarter of the first

The late date of the Gospel.

amount to a proof of difference of authorship, but only of a difference of date. The last verse of the chapter (xxi. 25) is open to more serious objections, both internal and external.

1 This seems to be the object of xxi. 23. The danger and the correction of such an error as is noticed belong equally to the period of the extreme age of the Apostle.

2 Can. Murat. (*Hist. of N. T. Canon*, p. 559): Cohortantibus condiscipulis et episcopis suis dixit (*sc.* Johannes): Conjejunate mihi hodie triduum, et quid cuique fuerit revelatum alterutrum nobis enarremus. Eadem nocte revelatum Andreæ ex apostolis, ut recognoscentibus cunctis, Johannes suo nomine cuncta describeret. Jerome probably alludes to this tradition when he says: Ecclesiastica narrat historia, cum a patribus [Johannes] cogeretur ut scriberet, ita facturum se respondisse, si indicto jejunio in commune omnes Deum precarentur; quo expleto, revelatione saturatus, in illud prœmium cœlo veniens eructavit: *In principio erat Verbum* . . . (Hieron. *Comm. in Matt.* Prœm. p. 5). Cf. Clem. *ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14.

3 Clem. Alex. *ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14: ὁ Κλήμης . . . παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνέκαθεν πρεσβυτέρων τέθειται . . . τὸν Ἰωάννην ἔσχατον συνιδόντα ὅτι τὰ σωματικὰ ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις δεδήλωται, προτραπέντα ὑπὸ τῶν γνωρίμων, πνεύματι θεοφορηθέντα, πνευματικὸν ποιῆσαι εὐαγγέλιον. Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.* iii. 1, 1; *ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* v. 8); Origen (*ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25).

century, and in its present form probably to the last decennium of the period. This late date of the writing is scarcely of less importance than its peculiarly personal character, if we would form a correct estimate of the evidence which establishes its early use and authority. It passed into circulation when the first oral Gospel was widely current in three authoritative forms, and it bore upon its surface, no less than in its inmost depths, a stamp of individuality, by which it was distinguished from the type of recognized tradition. Yet these facts, which must at first have limited the use of the book, contribute to the clearness of the testimonies by which the use is evinced. There is not in this case the same ambiguity as to the origin of a striking coincidence of language, as in the early parallels with the Synoptic Gospels, since there is no trace of any definite tradition similar to the record of St. John. The record was itself a creative source, and not a summary; the opening of a new field of thought, and not the gathered harvest. Clear parallelism of words or ideas with St. John's Gospel in later writers attests the use of the book, and cannot be referred to the influence of a common original.

The testimony of of the Apostolic Fathers.

The earliest Christian writers exhibit more or less distinctly the marks of St. John's teaching.[1] This is most clearly seen in Ignatius, who, perhaps, more than any other among the sub-apostolic fathers, resembled him in natural character. Without an acquaintance with St. John's writings, it is difficult to understand that he could have spoken in some cases as he does; but if he were acquainted with them, the subtle resemblance which exists is at once intelligible.[2] Polycarp, in like manner, obviously refers to a passage in the first Epistle of St. John;[3] and Papias, according to

1 Cf. *Hist. of N. T. Canon*, pp. 31, 43, 100, 225.

2 Cf. Ign. *ad Smyrn.* 3, 5, 12; *ad Eph.* 7; *ad Magn.* 1; *ad Rom.* 7.

3 Polyc. *ad Smyrn.* 7: πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι, ἀντίχριστός ἐστι (1 John iv. 3. Cf. Nott. critt. *ad loc.*).

Eusebius, "made use of testimonies" out of it.[1] The importance of this evidence is the greater, because it proceeds from a quarter in which we might naturally look for the most certain information. Polycarp was himself a disciple of the Apostle, and Papias conversed with those who had been. Nor is it an objection that the coincidences are with the Epistle rather than with the Gospel, for the two writings are so essentially united that their apostolical authority must be decided by one inquiry.

The testimony of the Fathers of the second century.

In the next generation the traces of the use of the Gospel, and not only of the general influence of St. John's writings, are indisputable. The "elders," who are quoted by Irenæus, interpret a saying of our Lord recorded by St. John,[2] and the Asiatic source of the reference contributes something to its weight. Though the question has been keenly debated, with some exaggeration on both sides, there can be no reasonable doubt that Justin Martyr was acquainted with St. John's Gospel, and referred to it as one of those written by apostles, as contrasted with those which were written by their followers.[3] Quotations from the book occur shortly afterwards in the writings of Apollinaris,[4] Tatian,[5] Athenagoras,[6] Polycrates,[7] and in the Epistle of the Church of Vienne.[8] The first direct quotation of the

1 Papias *ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 24.

2 Iren. v. 36, 2: ὡς οἱ πρεσβύτεροι λέγουσι . . . καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εἰρηκέναι τὸν Κύριον, ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου μοναὶ εἶναι πολλάί (John xiv. 2, ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ πατρός μου μοναὶ πολλαί εἰσιν). The use of the phrase of St. Luke (ii. 49, ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου) is worthy of notice.

3 *Hist. of N. T. Canon*, 178, 201.

4 Claud. Apollin. *ap.* Routh, *Rell. Sacræ*, i. 161: ὁ τὴν ἁγίαν πλευρὰν ἐκκεντηθείς, ὁ ἐκχέας ἐκ τῆς πλευρᾶς αὐτοῦ τὰ δύο πάλιν καθάρσια, ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα, λόγον καὶ πνεύμα (John xix. 34).

5 Tatian, *Orat. ad Græc.* 19: πάντα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ γέγονεν οὐδὲ ἕν. Cf. capp. 5. 13.

6 Athenagoras, *Supplic. pro Christ.* 10; ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν ἰδέᾳ καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ· πρὸς αὐτοῦ γὰρ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ πάντα ἐγένετο, ἑνὸς ὄντος τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ (John i. 3; xvii. 21—23).

7 Polycr. *ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24: ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναπεσών . . . (John xiii. 25).

8 Routh, *Rell. Sacræ*, i. 300: τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν εἰρημένον ὅτι Ἐλεύσεται καιρὸς ἐν ᾧ πᾶς ὁ ἀποκτείνας ὑμᾶς δόξει λατρείαν προσφέρειν τῷ Θεῷ (John xvi. 2.).

Gospel by name occurs in Theophilus;[1] and in the last quarter of the second century it was universally received as an authentic and unquestioned work of the Apostle. As such, it is included in the early Eastern Canon of the Peshito, and in the Western Canon of Muratori; and from this time all the great fathers of every section of the Church argue on the basis of its universal reception and Divine authority.

The testimony of heretical writers.

The reception of the Gospel among heretical teachers was scarcely less general than its reception in the Catholic Church. Its individuality preserved it from the conflict which the Synoptic Gospels supported with other versions of the same fundamental narrative. There is an apparent allusion to it in the "great announcement" which was attributed to Simon Magus;[2] and it is evidently referred to in the writings of the early Ophites[3] and Peratici.[4] It is still more worthy of notice that it is quoted in the Clementine Homilies, which are the production of another school.[5] Basilides, "who lived not long after the times of the Apostles," and Valentinus distinctly refer to it;[6] and Heracleon, the scholar of Valentinus, made it the subject of a commentary.[7]

1 Theophilus, *ad Autol.* ii. 22: ὅθεν διδάσκουσιν ἡμᾶς αἱ ἁγίαι γραφαὶ καὶ πάντες οἱ πνευματοφόροι, ἐξ ὧν Ἰωάννης λέγει· ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος. . . .

2 [Hipp.] *adv. Hær.* vi. 9: οἰκητήριον δὲ λέγει εἶναι [ὁ Σίμον] τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον τὸν ἐξ αἱμάτων γεγενημένον . . . (John i. 13).

3 [Hipp.] *adv. Hær.* v. 9: περὶ οὗ, φησίν, εἴρηκεν ὁ Σωτήρ· Εἰ ἤδεις τίς ἐστιν ὁ αἰτῶν, σὺ ἂν ἤτησας παρ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔδωκεν ἄν σοι πιεῖν ζῶν ὕδωρ ἁλλόμενον (John iv. 10); and many other passages.

4 [Hipp.] *adv. Hær.* v. 12: τοῦτό ἐστι, φησί, τὸ εἰρημένον, Οὐ γὰρ ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἀπολέσαι τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα σωθῇ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ.

5 *Clem. Hom.* xix. 22: ὅθεν καὶ ὁ διδάσκαλος ἡμῶν περὶ τοῦ ἐκ γενετῆς πηροῦ καὶ ἀναβλέψαντος παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξετάζουσι τοῖς μαθηταῖς, εἰ οὗτος ἥμαρτεν ἢ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῇ, ἀπεκρίνατο. οὔτε οὗτός τι ἥμαρτεν οὔτε οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἵνα δι' αὐτοῦ φανερωθῇ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς ἀγνοίας ἰωμένη τὰ ἁμαρτήματα (John ix. 1 ff.) Cf. Uhlhorn, *Die Homilien u. s. w.* 122 ff.

6 [Hipp.] *adv. Hær.*: τοῦτο, φησὶν [ὁ Βασιλείδης], ἐστὶ τὸ λεγόμενον ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις· ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον (John i. 9).

7 Origen. *in Joann.* Tom. xii. §§ 10 ff.

The chain of evidence in support of the authenticity of the Gospel is, indeed, complete and continuous, as far as it falls under our observation. Not one historical doubt is raised from any quarter, and the lines of evidence converge towards the point where the Gospel was written, and from which it was delivered to the Churches. On the other side one fact only can be brought forward. It is said, on the authority of Epiphanius, that the Gospel, as well as the other writings of St. John, were attributed to Cerinthus by a sect called *Alogi*.[1] Their name indicates the ground on which they proceeded. Their objections to the apostolic origin of the book were, as far as can be ascertained, purely internal; and it is not difficult to trace the course which the objectors may have followed, till they reached their final result. Such internal objections can always be strengthened by pointing out the defects which, from the nature of the case, must necessarily exist in the outward proof of the origin of a book in an age and in a society almost without literary instinct. But the true historic view, which regards the whole growth of Christianity within and without, furnishes a convincing answer to such skepticism, which is essentially partial. The development of later speculation becomes first explicable when it is traced out as the result of one definite impulse. The general tendency of all casual testimony is found to coincide with the conclusion which is assumed on all sides without hesitation when Christian literature first rose into importance. And a deeper study of the internal features of the Gospel will show that what appear to be difficulties and divergences from other parts of Scripture, belong to the fulness of its personal character, and contribute equally to the completeness of the teaching which it conveys, and to the perfection of that image of the Saviour which it presents, in combination with the records of the other Evangelists.

This testimony continuous and convergent.

The skepticism of the Alogi.

1 Epiph. *Hær.* li. 3. Cf. *Hist. of N. T. Canon*, pp. 1305 ff.

2. *The internal character of the Gospel.*

The internal character of St. John's Gospel offers in fact an almost boundless field for inquiry. It presents the results of the most consummate art as springing from the most perfect simplicity. The general effect of its distinct individuality is heightened by a careful examination of the various details by which the whole impression is produced. In language, substance, and plan the narrative differs from the Synoptic Gospels; and each of the points thus offered to investigation will require some notice.

(*a*) *Its language.*

The language of St. John presents peculiarities both in words and constructions which mutually illustrate one another. In both an extreme simplicity and an apparent sameness cover a depth of meaning, which upon a nearer view is felt to be inexhaustible. The simplicity springs from the contemplation of Christianity in its most fundamental relations; the sameness, from the distinct regard of the subject in each separate light, by which every step in the narrative is, as it were, isolated, instead of being merged in one complex whole.[1]

i. *The* vocabulary.

The Introduction to the Gospel furnishes the most complete illustration of its characteristic vocabulary. "The Word," "the Life," "the Light," "the Darkness," "the Truth," "the World,"[2] "Glory,"

1 In examining the language of St. John I have derived very considerable help from the valuable work of Luthardt, *Das Johanneische Evangelium*. Nürnberg, 1852. Throughout I have compared and corrected my own conclusions by his, with the greatest advantage.

2 The use and meaning of these words, which were applied in very early times to strange and mystical schemes (Iren. i. 8, 5 ff. σαφῶς οὖν δεδήλωκεν ὁ Ἰωάννης διὰ τῶν λόγων τούτων τά τε ἄλλα καὶ τὴν τετράδα τὴν δευτέραν, Λόγον καὶ Ζωήν, Ἄνθρωπον καὶ Ἐκκλησίαν· Ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τὴν πρώτην ἐμήνυσε τετράδα . . . : Πατέρα εἰπὼν καὶ Χάριν καὶ τὸν Μονογενῆ καὶ Ἀλήθειαν), is full of interest.

The term *the Word* (ὁ Λόγος), absolutely as a title of the Son of God, is found only in the Preface to the Gospel (i. 1; 14), where it occurs four times. It occurs in the cognate phrase *the Word of God* in the Apocalypse (Apoc. xix. 13); and in a passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews (iv. 12, 13), the simple and derived meanings of the term, as the Revelation, and the Person in whom the revelation centres, are com-

"Grace," are terms which at once place the reader beyond the scene of a limited, earthly conflict, and raise his thoughts

bined with the notion of an account to be rendered. In the LXX. λόγος is the usual representative of דָּבָר, and occurs in those passages in which later interpreters have found the traces of a fuller revelation of the Divine nature: *e. g.*, Ps. xxxii. 6; cvi. 20. Isa. xxxviii. 4, etc. In the Latin Versions of the New Testament, as represented by MSS. of every class, λόγος is translated by *Verbum*, which falls very far short even of a partial rendering of the Greek. There is, however, evidence that in the second century *sermo* was also current, which is, in some respects, a preferable rendering (Tertull. *adv. Hermog.* xx. etc. and constantly); and Tertullian seems to prefer *ratio*, though he implies that that had not been adopted in any version (*adv. Prax.* v. Ideoque jam in usu est nostrorum, per simplicitatem interpretationis, *sermonem* dicere *in primordio apud Deum fuisse*, cum magis *rationem* competat antiquiorem haberi, quia non sermonalis a principio sed rationalis Deus. . . . In *de Carne Chr.* xviii. he reads *verbum* caro factum est).

The *Life* (ἡ ζωή) is a term of much wider application. It occurs not only in the preface of the Evangelist, but also in the discourses of our Lord, and in one phrase full of deep meaning — "to enter into life" (εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωήν) — it is found in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark (Matt. xviii. 8, 9; xix. 17. Mark ix. 43, 45. Cf. Matt. vii. 14). In the Epistles of St. Paul the word is only less important than in St. John (Cf. Rom. v. 10; viii. 10. Col. iii. 4. 2 Tim. i. 1); and it is found, though rarely, in the other Epistles (Cf. Hebr. vii. 16. Jac. i. 12. 1 Pet. iii. 7. 2 Pet. i. 3). In the writings of St. John; Christ is presented as *the Life* under various aspects. At one time He proclaims Himself to be "the Resurrection and the Life" (ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή) in the presence of material death (John xi. 25), and again as "the Way, the Truth, and the Life" (ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωή) in the presence of religious doubt (xiv. 6). In this latter sense St. John says, "The Life was the Light of men" (καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. i. 4), that "Light of Life" (τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς), as it is elsewhere called (viii. 12), which he shall have who follows Christ. "The Life" (1 John i. 2; v. 20) lies beneath all physical and spiritual being and action, absolutely one, and universally pervading. At other times the single gift and source of life is contemplated in the separate parts or modes in which it is presented. "I am the bread of Life" (ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τ. ζωῆς. vi. 35, 48); "the words (ῥήματα) which I have spoken unto you, they are spirit and they are life" (vi. 63, cf. v. 68); "I will give to him that thirsteth of the fountain of the water of life" (Apoc. xxi. 6. Cf. xxii. 1, 17; vii. 19. John iv. 14); "to him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life" (τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς. Apoc. ii. 7. Cf. xxii. 2, 14, 19); "His [the Father's] commandment is life eternal" (xii. 50); "this is life eternal, that they know thee (ἵνα γινώσκωσιν) the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent" (ἀπέστειλας· xvii. 3); "these things have been written . . . . that ye may have life in His (Christ's) name" (xx. 31). Elsewhere it is regarded as something present in the Father (v. 26), in the Son (v. 26, ζωὴν ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ), and in those united in fellowship with Christ (vi. 53, 54; v. 40; iii. 15, 16, 36), varying in degree (x. 10, ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχωσιν καὶ περισσὸν ἔχωσιν), present in one sense (v. 24), and yet future (xii. 25. Cf. vi. 27; iv. 36), personal (1 John v. 12, 16), and yet extending to "the world" (vi. 51). [Compare the use of ζωοποιέω v. 21; vi. 63, and in St. Paul, and 1 Pet. iii. 18.]

to the unseen and the eternal. The conflict of good and evil is presented in an image which conveys in final distinctness the idea of absolute antagonism. The Incarnation itself is regarded as the great climax of the revelations of Him in whom all things "were" and by whom all things "became." Yet the Life and the Light and the Truth, are no mere abstractions, but centre in a person. The one predominating idea, partial and yet true, passes into the other in the consideration of new relations. The Life, which, in its fullest sense, is the most noble expression of creative power, becomes the Light in regard to men; and the sum of that which the Light reveals is the Truth. From stage to stage the whole is laid open which was contained implicitly in the first prophetic announcement. For nowhere is the spiritual depth of St. John's Gospel more clearly imaged

The grand notion of "Life" as the divine basis of all being, is limited in that of "*Light*," which is one of the forms in which it is presented to *men* (i. 4). "God is light" (1 John i. 5), even as Christ is light (i. 4—9; iii. 19; xii. 46), "the light of the world" (viii. 12), during His presence (xii. 35, 36; ix. 5), and after His bodily withdrawal (1 John ii. 8), in which the believer abides (1 John ii. 10) and walks (1 John i. 7). The opposite to this heavenly light (cf. xi. 9, 10), is "the *Darkness*" (σκοτία metaph. only in St. John, σκότος only iii. 19. 1 John i. 6), in which others walk (viii. 12; xii. 35. 1 John ii. 11) and abide (xii. 46) and are (1 John i. 9), and which overwhelms them (xii. 35), and blinds them (1 John ii. 11), though it cannot overwhelm the Light (i. 5). [Compare the use of φαίνειν, φανεροῦν, φωτίζειν.]

In another aspect the revelation which brings life and light, and in one sense *is* life and light, is the *Truth*. In the use of this word St. John, standing in marked contrast with the synoptists, offers a close parallel with St. Paul. Christ Himself is the truth (xiv. 6), even as the revelation (λόγος) of God (xvii. 17); and the Holy Spirit as the Guide of the future Church, is essentially "the Spirit of truth" (xiv. 17; xv. 26; xvi. 13. 1 John iv. 6), and "the Spirit is the Truth" (1 John v. 6). But while the Truth is expressed in language (viii. 40), it extends to action (iii. 21. 1 John i. 6, ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν), and brings with it freedom (viii. 32) and holiness (xvii. 17, 19). [Compare the use of ἀληθής, ἀληθινός.]

The sphere to which this all-embracing revelation is addressed is "the *world*" (ὁ κόσμος), a word which, while it occurs in this application in St. Matthew (xiii. 38; xxvi. 13), and St. Mark (xvi. 15), and more frequently in St. Paul, is yet so common in its ethical sense in St. John as to be highly characteristic of his writings. Christ "takes the sin of the world" (i. 29. 1 John ii. 2), "gives life to the world" (vi. 35. Cf. v. 51. 1 John iv. 9), came "to save the world" (xii. 47; iii. 17. 1 John iv. 14. Cf. iv. 42), is "the light of the world" (viii. 12; ix. 5); and conversely, "the world could not receive" Him (xiv. 17), but hated Him (xv. 18).

than in the one term which is most commonly and most rightly associated with it. When St. John surveys in his own person, in a few sentences, the great facts of the Incarnation in their connection with all the past and all the future, and as they reach beyond the very bounds of time, he speaks of the Lord under a title (λόγος) which is only faintly and partially imaged by "the Word." The rendering, even on the one side which it approaches, limits and confines that which in the original is wide and discursive. As far as the term *Logos* expresses a revelation, it is not an isolated utterance, but a connected story, a whole and not a part, perfect in itself, and including the notions of design and completion. But the meaning of *Logos* is only half-embraced by the most full recognition of the idea of a given revelation, conveyed by one who is at once the Messenger and the Message, speaking from the beginning in the hearts of men, of whom He was the Life and Light, and by the mouth of those who were His prophets: it includes also that yet higher idea, which we cannot conceive except by the help of the language which declares it, according to which the revelation is, in human language, as thought, and the Revealer as reason, in relation to the Deity. In this sense the title lifts us beyond the clouds of earth and time, and shows that that which has been realized among men in the slow progress of the world's history, was, towards God, in the depths of the Divine Being before creation. These vast truths, which are included in the one term by which St. John describes the Lord, had been dimly seen, from one side or the other, by many who had studied the records of the Old Testament. Now they brought forward the notion of a divine Reason, in which the typical "ideas" of the world were supposed to reside: now of a divine Word, by which God held converse with created beings; but at this point the boldest paused.[1] No one had dared to form such a sentence as that which, with almost awful simplicity, declares the central fact of Redemption,

1 Cf. pp. 161—166.

in connection with time and eternity, with action and with being: "*The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us;*" and it may well seem that the light of a divine presence still ever burns in that heavenly message, thus written for us, as clearly as it burnt of old on the breastplate of priest, or among the company of the first disciples. If any one utterance can bear the clear stamp of God's signature, surely that does which announces the fulfilment of the hopes of a whole world with the boldness of simple affirmation, and in language which elevates the soul which embraces it.[1]

ii. *The composition.* *Simplicity.*

If we pass from the vocabulary of St. John to the form of his sentences, what has been said of the former still holds good in new relations. The characteristics which mark the elements of his language, mark also his style of composition. There is the same simplicity and depth in the formation of his

1 In addition to the characteristic words of St. John, which have been already noticed (p. 241, n. 2), there are many others which illustrate in a remarkable way the spirit of his Gospel. Among these may be mentioned:

θάνατος (in 1 *Ep.* and *Apoc.*),
μαρτυρία, μαρτυρεῖν (*Gosp. Epp. Apoc.*),
κρίσις, κρίνειν (*Gosp. Apoc.*),
ἔργον, τὰ ἔργα (*Gosp.*),
πιστεύω εἰς (*Gosp.* 1 *Epp.* πίστις only 1 John, v. 4, ἡ πίστις not in *Gosp.*),
ὄνομα (*Gosp. Epp. Apoc.*),
γινώσκω (*Gosp. Epp. Apoc.*),
σημεῖον (*Gosp. Apoc.*),
ἁμαρτία (*Gosp.* 1 *Ep.*),
σάρξ (*Gosp.*),
ἀγαπᾶν, ἀγάπη (*Gosp. Epp.*),
θεᾶσθαι, θεωρεῖν (*Gosp.* 1 *Ep.*),
ἐρωτᾶν (*Gosp. Epp.*),
ὁ πατήρ (*Gosp. Epp. Apoc.*),
πρόβατα, τεκνία (*Gosp.* 1 *Ep.*),
παροιμία (*Gosp.* also 2 Pet. ii. 22),
ἀμήν, ἀμήν (*Gosp.*),
πιάζειν (*Gosp. Apoc.*),
ὄχλος (sing.), in pl. only vii. 12, with *var. lect.*
τὰ ἴδια (also Acts xxi. 6).

The amount of words peculiar to St. John is very large. In the Gospel I have counted *sixty-five*, and there are possibly more. In the main these spring out of the peculiar details of his narrative: *e. g.* ἀντλεῖν, ἀποσυνάγωγος, γλωσσόκομον, κλῆμα, σκέλος, τίτλος, ὑδρία, ψωμίον. Some are characteristic: Δίδυμος, Ἑβραϊστί, ἀρνίον, σκηνοῦν. Many words occur with remarkable frequency in St. John, as οὖν, ἵνα, μέντοι, ἴδε, οὔπω, πώποτε, ἐγώ, ἐμός, and their usage is full of meaning.

The absence of some words is equally worthy of notice, as, for instance, δύναμις, δυνάμεις, ἐπιτιμᾶν εὐαγγέλιον (and derivatives), παραβολή, παραγγέλλειν, πίστις, σοφία, σοφός. In this connection it may be noticed that St. John speaks of John *the Baptist* simply as *John;* the title does not occur in the Gospel — a small trait which would not have been preserved by a later writer.

recurrent constructions as in the choice of his familiar words; and these qualities bring with them, in each separate sentence, clearness and force. Like the key-words of his language, his constructions are almost without exception most obvious and plain.[1] The effect which they produce is not gained by any startling or subtle form of expression, but only by a calm and impressive emphasis. Clauses are rather appended than subordinated. Every thing is placed before the reader in a direct form, even in the record of the words of others, when the oblique narration is most natural; "Many of the people, therefore, when they heard this saying, said, Of a truth this is the Prophet. Others said, This is the Christ. But some said, Shall Christ come out of Galilee?"[2] If remarks are added either to bring out more strongly the features of the scene, or to connect the history with the immediate time, they are added for the most part in abrupt parentheses: "Jesus, therefore, being wearied with His journey, sat thus on the well. It was about the sixth hour. There cometh a woman of Samaria to draw water."[3]

Directness.

One result of this form of writing is circumstantiality. The different details which are included in an action are given with individual care. Word is added to word, when it might have been thought that the new feature was already included in the picture; and yet in such sentences as "Jesus cried out in the Temple, teaching and saying," "they questioned Him, and said to Him," and the like, it will be found that there is something gained by the distinct expression of each mo-

Circumstantiality.

1 A remarkable sign of this is found in the singular fact that St. John *never* uses the optative (Credner, *Einl.* § 96). In xiii. 24, the reading καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Εἰπὲ τίς ἐστιν is certainly correct.

In like manner the particle ἄν is only found in the construction with the indicative (iv. 10, etc.), except in the connection ὃς ἄν, ὅστις ἄν, ὅσος ἄν.

2 John vii. 40, 41. Cf. i. 19—27; ix. 3 ff.; viii. 22; ix. 41; xxi. 20. In John iv. 51, the authorities are divided, and if ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ be the right reading, it probably stands alone as an example of oblique construction (cf. Luthardt, p. 37). The common reading in xiii. 24, πυθέσθαι τίς εἴη, is incorrect. Cf. supr. n. 1.

3 iv. 6. Cf. x. 22; xiii. 30; vi. 10; xviii. 40.

ment in the narrative which might otherwise have been overlooked.[1]

Repetition.

Another mode in which this fundamental character of St. John's style shows itself is repetition. The subject, or chief word of the whole sentence, is constantly repeated, both in the narrative and in the recital of our Lord's discourses. "In the beginning was the Word; and the Word was with God; and the Word was God." "Jesus then, when he saw her weeping, and the Jews that were with her weeping." . . . . "If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true. There is another that beareth witness of me; and I know that the witness which he witnesseth of me is true."[2]

Individuality of narrative.

This tendency to emphatic repetition may be seen again in the way in which the persons involved in the dialogue are brought out into clear antagonism. Sentence after sentence opens with the clauses, "Jesus said," "the Jews said," so that the characters engaged in the great conflict are never absent from the mind of the reader;[3] and a similar emphasis is gained in other sentences by the introduction of a demonstrative pronoun, when an important clause has intervened between the subject and the verb: "He that seeketh His glory that sent him, the same (οὗτος) is true."[4]

It is to be referred to the same instinctive desire to

1 i. 25; vii. 28. Compare i. 15, 32; viii. 12; xii. 44, etc. A very simple and common example of this characteristic occurs in the constant use of ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν for the usual ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν or ἀπεκρίθη λέγων of the other Evangelists. The two ideas are coördinated, and not subordinated. The phrase occurs, if I have noticed rightly, thirty-three times in St. John, and elsewhere only Mark vii. 28; Luke xiii. 15; xvii. 20.

It is a consequence of the same principle that we find such phrases as ἐγὼ . . . ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἥκω οὐδὲ . . . . ἐλήλυθα (viii. 42).

2 i. 1; xi. 33; v. 31, 32. Compare i. 10; v. 46, 47; xv. 4 ff.; xvii. 25.

3 *E. g.* viii. 49 ff.; x. 23 ff. It is, however, to be remarked that in these cases the *verb* is put first: iv. 7 ff. etc.

4 vii. 18. Compare vi. 46; xv. 5. 2 John 9; i. 31; iii. 32; v. 38; x. 25 (οὗτος). i. 18, 33; v. 11, 37; (ix. 37;) x. 1; xii. 48; xiv. 21, 26; xv. 26 (ἐκεῖνος). The former pronoun occurs in the other Gospels in this kind of construction several times (Matt. xiii. 20 ff.; Mark vi. 16; Luke ix. 48): the latter, as far as I know, only twice: Mark vii. 15, 20.

realize the full personality of the action, so to speak, that St. John frequently uses the participle and substantive verb for the more natural finite verb. The distinction between the two forms of expression is capable only of a rude representation in English; yet even so, it is possible to appreciate the difference between the phrases "I bear witness," and "I am one who bears witness," and to feel that the idea of the action predominates in the one, and that of the person in the other.[1] Elsewhere the force of the clause is heightened, in a way which the English idiom cannot express, by the position of the verb at the beginning of the sentence. The central idea of the whole is given first, and the remainder of the sentence is made dependent upon it.[2]

Personality of action.

All these peculiarities converge to the same point. The simplicity, the directness, the particularity, the emphasis of St. John's style, give his writings a marvellous power, which is not, perhaps, felt at first. Yet his words seem to hang about the reader till he is forced to remember them. Each great truth sounds like the burden of a strain, ever falling upon the ear with a calm persistency which secures attention. And apart from forms of expression with which all are early familiarized, there is no book in the Bible which has furnished so many figures of the Person and Work of Christ which have passed into the common use of Christians, as the Gospel of St. John. "I am the bread of life;" "I am the light of the world;" "I am the good shepherd;" "I am the vine;" are words which have guided the thoughts of believers from the first ages.[3]

The combined effects of these characteristics.

1 v. 39; viii. 18; xi. 1; xvii. 19, 23. If i. 9, ἦν τὸ φῶς—ἐρχόμενον, is an instance of this construction, the words must be explained not of one act, but of a series; not of the Incarnation only, but of a continuous manfestation. This construction occurs also in the other Gospels. Cf. Winer, *Gramm.* § 45, 5.

2 *E. g.* iv. 28, 30, 52, 53; vi. 7—11; vii. 45 f. This is specially the case in the phrases λέγει αὐτῷ, ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰ. Cf. p. 270, n. 3.

3 vi. 48, ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τ. ζωῆς. vi. 51, ἐγώ εἰμι ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν. viii. 12, ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου. x. 7, ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων. v. 9, ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα. x.

The combination of sentences. Simplicity.

The combination of the sentences in St. John offers a complete analogy to the construction of them. What has been said of the words and the constituent members of his sentences, applies equally to entire paragraphs. There is the same circumstantiality in the picture, as a whole, as in the details. Words, clauses, paragraphs, follow one another, in what may be taken for needless repetition, till the mind grows sensible of the varied light in which the object is placed, and grasps the complete image. The final effect of the entire narrative is inartificial, and yet intense and powerful. The multiplication of simple elements issues in a result of acknowledged grandeur; and the mode in which the result is produced leads the mind to dwell upon it with patient study. Sentences are added one to another rather than connected. Only the simplest conjunctions[1] are used, even when the dependence of the successive clauses is subtle and hidden. Equally often the narrative or discourse is continued without the help of any conjunctions, especially when the deepest feeling is roused, and the full heart embraces the whole scene, without distinguishing the subordination or sequence of the details; "And He said, Where have ye laid him? They say to Him, Come and see. Jesus wept."[2] Statement follows statement, and the reader is left to work out for himself the law by which they are bound together. It is as if St. John felt that each truth involves all truth; and that *the* truth was to be described, as he had seen it, by the portraiture of its

11, 14, ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός. xi. 25, ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή. xiv. 6, ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωή. xv. 1, 5, ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος.

The frequency of the pronoun ἐγώ in St. John's Gospel, compared with the Synoptists, points to the fulness of this personal revelation of our Lord. The simple phrase ἐγώ εἰμι occurs in all the Gospels.

1 The most common are καί and δέ, though both occur much less frequently in St. John than in the other Evangelists. The conjunction τέ, which is rare in the Gospels, occurs only ii. 15 (τέ — καί); iv. 42; vi. 18. In the two latter cases there is a various reading, δέ, supported by important evidence.

2 xi. 34, 35. Cf. i. 3, 6, 8 ff.; ii. 17; iv. 7, 10 ff.; xv.

several aspects, and not as it were discovered or displayed by any process of argument. For him knowledge was sight.[1]

Characteristic particles.

But while the particles in St. John occupy generally a very subordinate place, two which express a designed object (ἵνα) and a natural result (οὖν), however much these ideas may be hidden from the ordinary sight, are singularly frequent and important. The view which they open of the continuous working of a divine Providence, and of the sequence of human actions, is exactly that in which St. John may be supposed to have specially dwelt, and which he brings out with the greatest distinctness. "The Jews said unto him, It is not lawful for us to put any man to death; that (ἵνα) the saying of Jesus may be fulfilled, which he spake signifying what death he should die."[2] "When he had heard, therefore (οὖν), that he was sick, he abode two days still in the same place where he was."[3]

1 1 John i. 1. The frequency of the words θεωροῦν, θεᾶσθαι, ἑωρακέναι, which has been already noticed, is an indication of this characteristic of St. John. It is worthy of notice that in the Gospel and first Epistle he uses only the perfect of ὁρᾶν (ἑώρακα), which occurs twenty-six times. There can be no doubt that ἐθεώρουν is the true reading in vi. 2.

2 xviii. 32. This form of expression, ἵνα πληρωθῇ, is even more frequent in St. John than in St. Matthew, and it is found not only in the narrative of the Evangelist (xii. 38; xviii. 9, 32; xix. 24, 36), but also in the discourses of our Lord (xiii. 18; xv. 25; xvii. 12). The elliptical phrase, ἀλλ' ἵνα, which occurs Mark xiv. 49, is also worthy of particular notice: i. 8; ix. 3; (xi. 52;) xiii. 18; xiv. 31; xv. 25. 1 John ii. 19. Other examples of the use of ἵνα are interesting. In many cases it is used where in classical Greek a combination of the article with the infinitive would be the natural construction: iv. 34, ἐμὸν βρῶμά ἐστιν ἵνα ποιήσω τὸ θελ. vi. 29; (40;) xii. 23, ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα ἵνα δοξασθῇ. xiii. 1; xv. 8; xvi. 30; xvii. 3. 1 John i. 9; ii. 27; iv. 17. Cf. xiii. 2, 34; xv. 12, 13, 17. 1 John iii. 11, 23; v. 3. At other times it takes the place of a simple infinitive: xvii. 24, θέλω ἵνα . . . . ὦσιν; iv. 47; xvii. 15; xix. 31, 38; xi. 50; xvi. 7. 1 John iii. 1; v. 20. In both these cases the idea of purpose and design seems to have led to the change of expression, and this notion is very apparent in some simpler examples: xvi. 2, ἔρχεται ὥρα ἵνα πᾶς . . . . δόξῃ. x. 17. Cf. iii. 17; xii. 47; v. 7. 1 John v. 16.

3 Examples of the various characteristic uses of οὖν in St. John will be found in the following passages: ii. 22; iii. 25, 29; iv. 1, 6, 46; vi. 5; vii. 25, 28 ff.; viii. 12, 21, ff., 31, 38; x. 7; xii. 1, 3, 9, 17, 21; xi. 31 ff. etc. The word is almost confined to narrative, and occurs very rarely in the discourses. The sequence which it marks is one of fact and not of thought. In the Epistles

Connection by a key-word.

Another form of connection is equally characteristic of St. John, and equally instructive. Successive sentences, no less than the parts of a single sentence, are combined by the recurrence of a common word. The repetition of the key-words of the former sentence in that which follows, unites the new statement with that which preceded, and yet invests it, at the same time, with an individual worth. Sometimes the subject is repeated: "I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep."[1] Sometimes what appears a subordinate word is transferred to the first place: "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. Ye are my friends."[2] . . . . Sometimes a clause is repeated which gives the theme of the passage: "I am the true vine; . . . . I am the vine: ye are the branches;"[3] . . . . and again, one which repeats its closing cadence:[4] "The world hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. . . . . They are not of the world, as I am not of the world. . . . . Sanctify them in the truth . . . . that they may be sanctified in the truth."[5]

Parallelism.

This repetition is connected with another peculiarity of St. John's style, which is observable both in the simple sentences and in the connected record — the spirit of parallelism — the informing power

it occurs only 3 John 8. In 1 John ii. 24; iv. 19, it is wrongly inserted in some copies.

1 x. 11. In referring here and elsewhere to our Lord's discourses as recorded by St. John for illustrations of St. John's style, I may repeat (to avoid misconstruction) what has been said before of the relation of the Evangelist to the words which he records. Nothing can be further from my wish than to question the Divine authority of the Evangelic records of the Lord's teaching. But few can suppose that the Evangelists have preserved generally either the exact or the entire words of the discourse recorded. St. John in particular, from the individual character of his Gospel, appears to present exactly so much of each discourse as his natural peculiarities of conception and language fitted him to preserve, fulfilling in this way his providential function in the instruction of the Church. The record is absolutely true, and yet not complete.

2 xv. 13, 14.

3 xv. 1, 5.

4 xvii. 14—19.

5 This remarkable characteristic finds a place even in the history; xviii. 18, 25.

of Hebrew poetry — which runs through it. It would not be possible to find a more perfect example of parallelism than the blessing of the Lord: "Peace I leave unto you; my peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid."[1] . . . . But such instances are naturally very rare, as they are essentially poetical, though simpler forms both of direct[2] and antithetic[3] parallelism occur throughout the book. That parallelism, however, which is most characteristic of St. John, is a progressive or constructive parallelism,[4] or rather a symmetrical progression. The subject is stated and pursued to a definite result; it is then stated again, with the addition of the new conclusion, and carried to another limit. In this way the truth is presented, as it were, in a series of concentric circles, ever widening; each one in succession includes all that have gone before, and is in part determined by them.[5]

(b) The plan of St. John's Gospel. The Gospel an Epic poem.

This characteristic parallelism in thought and language, which is found in the narrative and discourses of St. John, leads the way to the truest appreciation of the entire Gospel. It is, in fact, the divine Hebrew Epic. Every part is impressed with the noblest features of Hebrew poetry, and the treatment of the subject satisfies the conditions of variety, progress, and completeness, which, when combined with the essential nature of the subject itself, make up the notion of a true Epic. The history is not only of national, but of universal interest. The development of faith and unbelief in the course of the Saviour's life, up to the last agony of the Passion and the last charge of the

1 xiv. 27.

2 *E. g.* viii. 23.

3 *E. g.* vii. 6; viii. 14, 35, 38; xvi. 16, 28.

4 One simple form in which this shows itself is the repetition of a clause either as the *burden: e. g.* vi. 39, 40, 44, ἐγὼ ἀναστήσω ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ; xviii. 18, 25. ἦν δὲ [Πέτρος] ἑστὼς καὶ θερμαινόμενος — or as the *theme: e. g.* x. 7, 9, ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα; x. 11, 14, ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός. Cf. xvii. 14—16.

5 The discourses in chaps. x. xvii. will furnish a sufficient illustration of this method of arrangement.

risen Lord, presents a moral picture of unapproachable grandeur. (The separate incidents subserve to the exhibition of the one central idea of "the Word made flesh dwelling among men;" and everything is contemplated in its truly poetic, that is, in its permanent and typical, aspect. Outward magnitude alone is wanting; and if the narrative falls short in mere extent, this secondary accident cannot neutralize all the other details in which the Gospel fulfils the requirements of an Epic.

Not by design, but in virtue of its subject.

But the fact that the Gospel is in the highest sense a poem, is not to be so interpreted as to bring into a prominent light the notion of art or composition. The Gospel is a poem, because it is the simple utterance of a mind which received into itself most deeply, and reproduced most simply, absolute truth. It is an Epic, because it is the divine reflection of the Life of the Son of God, not taken in a special aspect, but as the Word manifested to men. (This circumstance alone distinguishes it from the other Gospels, which are memoirs rather than poems, because they present the Life of Christ under limited relations, and not chiefly or uniformly in its relation to the Infinite. And if that be a true definition of poetry which describes it as the power of giving "Infinity" to things, that is no less truly poetry which preserves, in a peculiar sense, the idea of its "Infinity" in the record of the Divine Life.

The subject and object of the Gospel.

This view of St. John's Gospel will be of considerable help in understanding its plan; for while it is the most natural outpouring of a soul full of the life of Christ,[1] the idea which was foremost in the Apostle's mind regulates the order of his narrative. The idea clothes itself in facts; and the symmetry, which elsewhere is the effect of purpose, is here the result, as it were, of an inner law. The subject which is announced in the opening verses is realized, step by step, in the course of the narrative. The Word "came to His

1 *E. g.* xx. 30. Cf. xxi. 25.

own," and they "received Him not;" but others "received Him," and thereby became "sons of God." This is the theme, which requires for its complete treatment, not a true record of events or teaching, but a view of the working of both on the hearts of men. The ethical element is coördinate with the historical; and the end which the Evangelist proposes to himself answers to this double current of his Gospel. He wrote that men might believe the fact that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and believing — by spiritual fellowship — might have life in his name.

Its great divisions. The Prologue.

After the Introduction (i. 1—18), which includes within a narrow compass an outline of the personal being of the Word, of His Revelation to men, and of His Incarnation, the main body of the Gospel falls into two great divisions, the first (i. 19—xii.) containing the record of the Life of Christ, the second the record of His Passion (xiii.—xx.). The whole is then closed by an epilogue, which carries forward the lessons of the Gospel to the history of the Church (xxi.). The division between the two great sections is marked by a two-fold pause. The Evangelist sums up the faithlessness of the Jews, and connects their final rejection of Messiah with the declarations of prophecy; and then records the words in which the Lord declared His relation to the Father and the world, foreshadowing the judgment which should follow on the rejection of His message.[2]

i. The Manifestation of Christ to men.

The first section may be generally described as the manifestation of Christ to men. Throughout the whole of it, and nowhere afterwards, Christ is described as the Light. Under this image He is first presented by St. John in the Introduction, and at the close of the twelfth chapter the Lord Himself, when

1 xx. 31, ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται, ἵνα πιστεύητε ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζωὴν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ — words which offer an instructive contrast to the popular theories of a polemical object in the Gospel. The Gospel is indeed truly polemical so far as the Truth is the only complete answer to all error.

2 xii. 36—43; 44—50.

He surveys the course of His teaching, repeats it for the last time.[1] A second idea is scarcely less characteristic: Christ is not only the Light, but He came to give Life.[2] "He that followeth Me," to use the remarkable words which he addressed to the Jews, "shall have *the light of life*." The manifestation of Christ centres in these truths, and is exhibited under two distinct aspects. The first conveys the announcement of the Gospel (i. 19—vi.); the second, the conflict (v.—xii.).

The Announcement.

At first, during a wide range of labor in Judæa, Samaria, and Galilee, among persons most widely separated by position and character, the revelation is made without exciting any direct antagonism. The elements of the future conflict are present, but visible only to the eye of Him who "knew what was in man."[3] The Gospel is laid before the world, and the reception which it was destined to meet is shown in detail in the portraiture of typical cases. The testimony of the Baptist and of signs (i. 19—ii. 25) is followed by personal revelation (iii.—iv.). The group of the first disciples, Nathanael, Nicodemus, the Samaritan woman, the Galilæan nobleman, exhibit various forms of faith and unbelief, and behind these individual characters glimpses of the popular feeling are given, which serve as a preparation for the next stage of the history. In this, the conflict between Christ and "the Jews" grows more and more hopeless, till the "chief Priests and Pharisees" finally determine to put Him to death. The desire "to kill Him" is marked at the opening of the period, and traced out on several successive occasions, till the feeling of the people was ratified by the deliberate judgment of the Sanhedrin.[4] In the mean time the same course of events which aroused

The Conflict.

1 The image occurs, i. 4—9; iii. 19; viii. 12; ix. 5; xii. 35, 46.

2 The phrases ἔχειν ζωήν, etc. occur thirty times in this section and only six times in the remainder of the Gospel.

3 ii. 25, ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ.

4 v. 18, ἐζήτουν ἀποκτεῖναι. vii. 1—25; viii. 37—40; xi. 53, συνεβουλεύσαντο ἵνα ἀποκτείνωσιν αὐτόν. Cf. viii. 59; x. 31; xi. 8.

the animosity of the Jews tried the spirit of the disciples. There is a conflict within as well as without; and they who had welcomed the first proclamation of the Gospel advance or fall back in faith as Christ revealed more fully His Person and Work.[1] This revelation proceeds in a three-fold order. In the first section, Christ is presented as the support of action and life (v., vi.); in the second, in a more special sense, as the Light (vii.—x.); in the third, as the giver of life in death (xi., xii.). Each of these ideas is illustrated by miraculous working; and the miracle both points the lesson, and serves as the centre and starting-point of the discourses which are grouped about it. Now, Christ gives strength to the impotent man, feeds the multitude in the wilderness, triumphs over the power of nature (v., vi.); now He gives sight to the man born blind (ix.); now he calls Lazarus from the grave (xi.). Each division is bound to that which precedes by the recollection of earlier conflicts;[2] and the whole finds its consummation in the twelfth chapter, which presents, in the most striking contrasts, the fruits of faith and unbelief in act (xii. 1—22) and sign (28—30) and word (44—50). Then, at the close of Christ's open ministry, Greeks come to claim admittance to Him, of whom the Pharisees said in anger, "Behold, the world is gone after Him" (xii. 19—22); and who said Himself, speaking of His death, "If I be lifted up from the earth, I will draw all men unto me" (xii. 32).

ii. *The issues of Christ's manifestation to men.*

The second great division of the Gospel (xiii.—xx.) differs from the first, both in the unity of scene and the briefness of the period over which it extends, and in the general character of its contents. The first describes the manifestation of Christ to men; the second presents the varied issues of that manifestation. In regard both of its substance and of its style it falls into two parts, of which the first (xiii.—

1 The different working of the Lord's words upon His hearers is constantly brought out by the Evangelist, vi. 60—69; vii. 12, 43; ix. 16; x. 19.

2 vii. 19 ff. compared with v. 16 ff.; xi. 8, compared with x. 39.

xvii.) contains the record of the Saviour's love as seen in His unrestrained intercourse with His disciples in the immediate prospect of His death; while the second exhibits the narrative of the Passion, as the crowning point of faith on one side and unbelief on the other, of humiliation and victory, of rejection and confession. A Church is founded on the cross; a ministry is commissioned in the chamber where the Apostles were gathered together in "fear of the Jews."[1]

The revelation of love.

The one great subject of the Lord's last discourses is the "new commandment," the love of Christians springing out of His love and His Father's love for them.[2] The point of departure is a symbolic act, which places in the clearest light the ministry of love; then, after the dismissal of the traitor (xiii. 31), the Christian law is proclaimed, with the warning against St. Peter's hasty assurance (xiii. 34—38). First, love is contemplated as it works in the absence of the Lord (xiv.), then as it springs from vital union with Him, the only source of love (xv.), then as it is fulfilled in the strength of the promised Spirit (xvi). And last of all, the priestly prayer of Christ (xvii.) is itself at once the fullest outpouring of love, and the surest pledge of the support of love among Christians. After the record of

The Passion.

the Passion, in which the glorified human nature of the risen Saviour is specially brought out, follows,

The Epilogue.

as a last appendix, the promise and the charge for the future. A last miracle conveys the lesson of encouragement to those who toil long: a last commission distinguishes the work which Christ's servants have still to do for Him.[3]

Even in this rapid outline it is impossible to overlook the unity of purpose and plan which runs through St.

1 Cf. xix. 34. 1 John v. 6, 8—xx. 19.

2 The words ἀγαπᾶν and ἀγάπη occur *thirty* times in these chapters (xiii.—xvii.) and only *thirteen* times besides in the remainder of the Gospel.

3 The following sketch of the construction of St. John's Gospel may be

John's Gospel. It is not, as the other Gospels, an individual view of a common subject, but the substance is itself peculiar. It is not only personal in its conception and working out, but it deals with the history of the Lord personally. It lays open

(c) The substance of St. John's Gospel.

of use in completing some of the gaps in the summary which has been given, and guiding the way to minuter inquiry.

THE INTRODUCTION. i. 1—18.
The Word in His own Nature. i. 1—5.
His Revelation to men. 6—13.
The Incarnation. 14—18.

I. THE MANIFESTATION OF CHRIST TO THE WORLD. i. 19—xii.

1. THE PROCLAMATION. i. 19—iv.
(*a*) *The Testimony.* i. 19—ii. 12.
a. The Testimony of John. i. 19—37.
b. The Testimony of disciples. i. 38—52.
c. The Testimony of signs (*The water made wine*). ii. 1—12.
(*b*) *The Work.* ii. 13—iv. 54.
a. With Jews. ii. 13—iii.
The people (ii. 13—25).
Representative men (iii).
Nicodemus, the teacher of the law (1—21).
John the Baptist, the last prophet (22—36).
b. With Samaritans. iv. 1—42.
The woman (iv. 5—30).
The people (iv. 39—42).
c. With Galilæans. iv. 43—54.
The people (iv. 43—45).
The nobleman (iv. 46—54). (*Nobleman's son healed*).

2. THE CONFLICT. v.—xii.
(*a*) *The Prelude.* v.—vi.
Christ the support of action and life.
(*The impotent man healed.*)
(*The feeding of the multitudes.*)
(*The walking on the sea.*)
(*b*) *The Contrast.* vii.—x.
Christ the source of truth, light, guidance.
(*The man blind from his birth healed.*)
(*c*) *The Separation.* xi.—xii.
Christ the giver of life to the dead. xi.
(*Lazarus raised.*)
The judgment of men (xii. 1—29); of the Evangelist (xii. 37—41); of Jesus (xii. 44—50).

II. THE ISSUES OF CHRIST'S MANIFESTATION. xiii.—xx.

1. THE CONSOLATION. xiii.—xvii.
(*a*) *Types.* xiii.
The true pattern. xiii. 1—17.
The traitor. 18—30.

to us the thoughts which lie beneath actions, and traces the gradual revelation of character. But while it is thus, in some sense, more complete than the other Gospels, in so far as it contains the complete spiritual portraiture of the Lord, which is the key to all His outward life, yet in fact it is as incomplete as they are. It is a poem and not a life; the exhibition of the most divine truth of which the world has been witness, and not the narrative of events which externally considered were infinite. The Old Tes-

The charge. xiii. 31—35.
The unstable. 36—38.
(*b*) *Love to Christ in absence.* xiv.
The union of Christ with the Father. xiv. 1—11.
This the source of the Christian's strength. 12—31.
(*c*) *Love to Christ the spring of love.* xv.
The mutual love of Christians. xv. 1—17.
The hatred of the world. 18—27.
(*d*) *The Promise.* xvi.
The Comforter. xvi. 1—15.
The Return. 16—24.
The Interval. 25—33.
(*e*) *The Prayer.* xvii.
For Christ himself. xvii. 1—5.
For the apostles. 6—19.
For all believers. 20—26.

2. THE VICTORY. xviii.—xx.
(*a*) *The betrayal.* xviii. 1—18, 25—27.
Judas. xviii. 1—14.
St. Peter. 15—18, 25—27.
(*b*) *The Judgment.* xviii. 19—xix. 16.
The Jews. xviii. 19—24.
Pilate. xviii. 28—xix. 16.
(*c*) *The End.* xix. 17—42.
The elevation on the cross. xix. 17—27.
The death of Jesus. 28—37.
The burial. 38—42.
(*d*) *The New Life.* xx. 1—29.
The revelation. xx. 1—18.
The commission. 19—23.
The abiding blessing. 24—29.
Conclusion. 30—31.

THE EPILOGUE. xxi.
The sign of the Future. xxi. 1—14
(*The Miraculous draught of Fishes.*)
The varied call of the disciples. 15—24.
Conclusion. 25.

tament prophecies,[1] the miracles,[2] the discourses which it notices are in one aspect confined in range, and yet they open out a way for every thought, and point to the Incarnation as the solution of every doubt. The materials are rather pregnant with varied instruction than copious,

1 The quotations from the Old Testament which occur in St. John are characteristic of his general manner. Some are verbal citations; some are slightly changed from the original text; some are deductions or adaptations based on the inner meaning of the prophetic words.

I. VERBAL QUOTATIONS.

John x. 34 = Ps. lxxxi. 6 (LXX. ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν = Hebr.)
[— xii. 13] = Ps. cxvii. 25, 26 (LXX. σῶσον δέ for Ὡσαννά).
— xii. 38 = Is. liii. 1 (LXX. — Hebr. *om.* Κύριε).
— xix. 24 = Ps. xxi. 19 (LXX. = Hebr.)
— xiii. 18 = Ps. xli. 9 (Hebr. *not* LXX.)
— xix. 37 = Zech. xii. 10 (Hebr. *not* LXX.)

II. VARIED QUOTATIONS.

1. Changes of Expression.

John i. 23 = Is. xl. 3 (εὐθύνατε for ἑτοιμάσατε — εὐθείας ποιεῖτε in LXX. and Hebr.).
— xii. 14, 15 = Zech. ix. 9 (μὴ φοβοῦ — καθήμ. ἐπὶ πῶλον ὄνου for χαῖρε σφόδρα — ἐπιβεβ. ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον in LXX. and Hebr.).
— xii. 39—41 = Is. vi. 9, 10 (τετύφλωκεν — πεπώρωκεν. Sense of Hebr. Varies from LXX.).

2. Changes of Form.

John ii. 17 = Ps. lxviii. 10 (καταφάγεται for κατέφαγεν).
— vi. 31 ff. = Ex. xvi. 4, 15; Ps. lxxvii. 24.
— vi. 45 = Is. liv. 13 (add. καὶ ἔσονται).
— viii. 17 = Deut. xix. 15.
— xv. 25 = Ps. xxxiv. 19 (direct (as Hebr.) from participial form).

III. ADAPTATIONS.

John vii. 38. Cf. Is. xii. 3; xliv. 3, etc.
[— xii. 34. Cf. Ps. lxxxviii. 36].
— xix. 36. Cf. Ex. xii. 46. Ps. xxxiii. 21.
xx. 9. Cf. Ps. xv. 10.

From the form of these quotations it would appear that St. John was familiar both with the Hebrew text and with the LXX.

2 The general position which the miracles recorded by St. John occupy in his narrative has been already marked. Taken by themselves, they present a whole pregnant with instruction.

I. THE MIRACLES OF OUR SAVIOUR DURING HIS MINISTRY.

1. Sovereignty over Nature — Absolutely.

The water made wine (ii. 1—11).

A type of the independence (*v.* 4) and transmuting power of the spiritual life.

exhaustive in their application rather than in their form; but the more the student pauses upon what seem abrupt transitions, fragmentary utterances, simple repetitions, the more he will advance to a certain perception of the absolute unity by which the whole Gospel is bound together, and of the infinite fulness of the revelation which it contains in the record of "the Word made flesh."

II. The relation of St. John to the Synoptic Gospels.

These reflections, which affect the contents of the Gospel as well as its style and form, lead to the second great point of our inquiry, — the relation in which the Gospel of St. John stands to the Synoptic narratives. The general features of difference between them have been already noticed;[1] but it remains to examine somewhat more in detail the special points of variation and coincidence, which stamp them with the marks of a real independence and of an underlying unity.

2. Sovereignty over Nature — Relatively to Man.
- (*a*) *Disease.*
  - *a. The ruler's son* (iv. 46—54).
    Mediative faith: above nature (*v.* 50).
  - *b. The man at Bethesda* (v. 1—9).
    Personal faith: above ritual (*v.* 9).
- (*b*) *Disorder.*
  - *a.* Natural wants (Gen. iii. 17).
    Feeding the five thousand (vi. 5—59).
    Leading to higher aims (*v.* 53).
  - *b.* Outward impediments.
    Walking on the sea (vi. 15—21).
    Leading to higher faith (*v.* 20).
  - *c.* Personal defects.
    The man born blind (ix. 1—7).
    Leading to higher responsibility (*v.* 39).
- [c) *Death.*
  The raising of Lazarus (xi.).
  Christ the source of Life (*v.* 25).

II. THE MIRACLE OF THE RISEN SAVIOUR.

The multitude of fishes (xxi. 1—8).
The type of the successful work of the Church.

It is not, I believe, fanciful to see a significance even in the number of these miracles. *Seven* are included in the record of Christ's ministry, and an *eighth* completes the typical representation of His work after the resurrection. *Seven*, according to the early belief, was the figure of a completed creation: *eight*, the figure of the resurrection, or new birth (Cf. Aug. *Ep.* lv. 23).

[1] Pp. 241, 251, 253 f.

The points of difference between St. John and the Synoptists are commonly classed under two heads, — differences as to the place and form of our Lord's teaching, and differences as to the view which is given of His Person.

1. Points of difference

The Synoptists, it is said, describe the public ministry of Christ as extending only over one year, and closing with a visit to Jerusalem, which was at once the first and the last which He made. St. John, on the other hand, records a visit to Jerusalem at the very commencement of His work, and notices several visits afterwards, which were spread over a period (apparently) of three years. The Synoptists, again, combine to present a picture of Christ's teaching characterized by simplicity, terseness and vigor, illustrated by frequent parables and summed up in striking proverbs, while St. John attributes to Him long and deep discourses, in which the argument is almost hidden by unnatural repetitions, and in which practical instruction is lost in the mazes of mystical speculation. In the former our Lord is described as a great moral reformer, laying open the fundamental principles of the Law which he came to fulfil, speaking as a man among men, though clothed with the dignity of a prophet; in the latter, from first to last, He is invested with a divine glory, claiming for Himself a relation with the Father which aroused to the utmost the anger of His enemies, and inspired His followers with hope, even in the prospect of bereavement. And yet further, it is urged that the differences are not confined to general differences of time and manner and character, but extend to important details of fact, since the miracles, which are represented by St. John as the turning-points of our Lord's course (as the raising of Lazarus) are unnoticed by the Synoptists.

as objections.

One answer may be made in common to all these objections, and to the last no other is necessary. They proceed upon the assumption that the Gospels are complete biographies. They would be of great weight if, on other grounds,

there were any reason to suppose that the Evangelists either told all the facts which they knew, or entertained the idea of writing histories. It has, however, been already shown that such a view of their purpose is wholly untenable.[1] The historical framework of their writings subserved to a doctrinal development. The form and extent of the narrative was determined by outward circumstances. The omission of one or other series of events or discourses is not equivalent to an exclusion of them, unless it can be shown that the two supplementary records are inconsistent. All truthful inquiry into the mutual relations of the Gospels must be based upon the fullest recognition of the fragmentariness. The question is not, Whether this fact is left unnoticed by one? nor even, Why it is left unnoticed? but, Is it actually set aside by some other record? Is it irreconcilable, either in occurrence or in conception, with what we learn from other sources? When the ground is thus limited, few who have studied the manifold aspects of the most common-place life will be prepared to affirm that differences of tone and style, however marked, are necessarily inconsistent when they are attributed to the same character; few who have been familiarized with the wide divergences in detail of authentic narratives professedly complete, will insist with excessive confidence on different ranges of subject in narratives composed for a special purpose, to which completeness was always subordinate.

The objections assume the completeness of each narrative.

But, besides this general answer, there are other presumptions which are sufficient to justify in fact what has been urged only as a possibility. The first objection that the locality and mode of our Lord's teaching, as recorded by St. John, are both different from those described by the Synoptists, is as much an undesigned coincidence as a difficulty. It would be natural to suppose that the

(a) The differences as to locality and manner of teaching mutually explain each other;

1 Pp. 176 ff. 212.

one would be, so to speak, a function of the other. The hearers and the doctrine are obviously connected by considerations of fitness. If it were the case that the method of instruction were the same while the persons were widely varied, or the persons the same while the teaching was changed, it might be fairly asked whether such differences would be likely to exist within the narrow limits over which the Lord's ministry was extended. But, as it is, if it appear that there is a clear propriety in the twofold variation, answering alike to the immediate object and to the permanent office of the books, then the ground of objection becomes an indication of providential design. The want of all ages is found to be satisfied in the record of the Saviour's labors in different countries and among different men.

and were involved in the history of the time.

That there was such a division in the Jewish nation, as is implied in the characteristics of the mass of our Lord's hearers in the Synoptists and St. John, is unquestionable. On the one side the peasantry of Galilee — that "warlike race," as Josephus describes them, who had in earlier times withstood the chariots of Sisera, and were yet again to vindicate their independence against the arms of Rome[1] — still clung to the literal faith of their fathers in simplicity and zeal. They wished to raise Jesus to an earthly throne,[2] and led Him in their Paschal train to the Holy City.[3] Their religion lay in action and their faith in obedience. But far different was the state of those Jews who had been brought into contact with Greek intellect or Roman order. For them new regions of thought were opened, which seemed

1 Compare Dr. Stanley's *Sermons on the Apostolic Age*, p. 84, *n.*

2 John vi. 15. The address which followed in the synagogue at Capernaum to those who were already partially instructed, may be compared with that in the synagogue at Nazareth (Luke iv. 16 ff.), at the beginning of Christ's ministry, as to its tone and results.

3 John xii. 12—19. While St. John recognizes the peculiar character of this Galilæan multitude, he does not detail the teaching addressed to them, which we find in the other Evangelists. This clearly points to a difference of scope and not to a divergence of tradition.

to indicate that religion was only for the wise. They felt the full difficulty of founding any universal earthly sway, and either rejected the Messianic hopes as the result of fanaticism, or saw in the course of things around them the signs of some mighty spiritual change which should more than fulfil the metaphors of the ancient prophets. To the former class, whether at Capernaum or at Jerusalem, we find the truths of Christianity addressed in their plainness and active power. Parables and maxims are multiplied to enliven their apprehension and direct their energy.[1] And on this teaching the missionary Gospels were naturally based, the Gospels of the Church's infancy and growth, because the same conditions which shaped its form in the first instance called for its preservation afterwards. But to those who were reared under other influences, to the student of the law, "the teacher of Israel," to the Samaritan, perplexed with doubts about the traditions of her fathers, to the cavillers who reposed in blind confidence on the Law, which was daily presented to them in the splendor of a noble ritual, to the disciples growing in faith, and yet unable to bear all that a loving Teacher would disclose, other modes of instruction were adapted. Now an awakening dialogue, now a startling revelation, now an outpouring of righteous zeal or gentle tenderness, furnished the materials for that Gospel which penetrates to the depths of individual life. Yet the popular and the personal styles of thought and language are perfectly harmonious. The histories which severally record them are not contradictory but complementary. They do not exclude but imply one another. They recognize generic differences which, as we know, existed among the Jews at the time; and it is no small proof of their authenticity that they satisfy the requirements of those great national parties in Judæa, which could scarcely have been realized

1 The parables addressed to the rulers and Pharisees in Matt. xxi. 28; xxii. 1 ff. were addressed to them in the presence and (as it seems) for the instruction of the multitude. Cf. Matt. xxi. 26, 46.

by a writer whose ideas were drawn from a time when the centre of Jewish life was destroyed.

Yet it may be said, that this general harmony between the two forms of teaching and the two classes of hearers is no answer to differences as to the time and place of Christ's ministry, as given by the different Evangelists. *If* the time were extended, *if* the place were varied, then the change in style would be intelligible; but the narrative of the Synoptists recognizes no such extension or movement. Here the incompleteness of the records precludes the possibility of a perfect answer; but it is enough that the Synoptists at least allow that the ministry of our Lord may have been as long and as diversified as St. John relates; and, indeed, many old writers, in their anxiety to establish a harmony between the Gospels, found in the fourth only an appendix to the other three, designed to fix their chronology and supply details which they left unnoticed.

Moreover the Synoptists allow of an extended ministry,

The very nature of the first promulgation of the Gospel, if we apprehend it according to the common laws of history, demanded a lengthened period for its accomplishment.[1] Apart from any express data, it must seem incredible that the course

which is antecedently probable, and

1 It is useful to call to mind constantly the extreme uncertainty which hangs over the exact length of our Lord's ministry. The only certain limits within which it must lie are the "15th year of the reign of Tiberius" (Luke iii. 1, A. D. 28) and the recall of Pilate, just before the death of that emperor, A. D. 37, which leaves room enough for the tradition mentioned by Irenæus, on the authority of Asiatic tradition, that our Lord was at least 40 years old at the time of His death (Iren. ii. 22, 5). Even in the time of Irenæus there was no satisfactory information on the point; and the uncertainty of the Jewish calendar will not allow of any conclusion based on the day of the Paschal festival. Allowing that St. John only mentions *three* passovers (excluding v. 1), I know of no arguments which can prove that he notices every passover in the course of our Lord's ministry; and in such a case it seems by far the wisest course to leave the question undecided, as the Gospels leave it.

I ought to refer the reader to the striking arguments of Mr. Browne (*Ordo Sæclorum*) in support of the belief that the Lord's ministry was limited to *one* year. If there were direct evidence in support of the omission of τὸ πάσχα in John vi. 4, his case would be very strong. As it is, the point, as it seems, must be left wholly undetermined.

of events which the Synoptists relate could have been compressed into a single year. Such narrow limits leave no adequate space for the development of faith in the disciples; for the transition from hope to hatred in the mass of the people; for the varied journeys on both sides of Jordan and to "the borders of Tyre and Sidon;" for the missions of the Apostles and the Seventy, without supposing a haste — almost a precipitancy — in the consummation of Christ's personal work, which finds no parallel in the history of His preparation or in the labors of the Apostles.

actually acknowledged by them.

But, in fact, the Synoptists imply, in rare passages, the existence of a much more extended ministry than they have described. St. Luke, in a casual date, marks the occurrence of a passover in the middle of his narrative;[1] and the various allusions to Jerusalem which are scattered through the first three Gospels show that the Lord must have been there before the time of the Passion;[2] while St. John, on the other hand, expressly notices that an earlier visit was made purposely in such a way as to avoid popular notice, "because the time (καιρός) was not yet fulfilled."[3]

And in the form of our Lord's teaching offer parallels to St. John.

The objection which is drawn from the variations in the form of our Lord's teaching admits also of a similar answer. The diversity is not only a necessary result of the diversity of hearers, as an extended scene was required by the nature of the message, but is actually recognized as existing in our present records. There are mutual coincidences between St. John and the Synoptists which break the abruptness of the transition from the one to the other.

1 Luke vi. 1, ἐν σαββάτῳ δευτεροπρώτῳ, yet it must be noticed that the word is omitted by important authorities.

2 Cf. Matt. iv. 25; xxiii. 37—39 (ποσάκις, ἅπαρτι); xxvii. 57. Luke x. 38 ff. (Cf. John xi. 5). See also Matt. xix. 1 (Cf. John x. 40); viii. 18.

3 John vii. 6, 10. St. John himself in this passage implies that Galilee was the chief theatre of our Lord's teaching and works (vii. 3, 4), though he had recorded two previous visits to Jerusalem. In other places he leaves ample room for the Galilæan ministry; ii. 12; iv. 43, 54; v. 1; vi. 1; vii. 1.

One fragment preserved by St. Matthew and St. Luke presents the closest resemblance in tone and manner to the discourses in St. John;[1] and St. John, while he avoids the exact type of the parable, has preserved the relation of addresses and acts, which are only parables transformed.[2] In this respect it might seem that the differences of teaching lead us beyond the two great classes of hearers in Galilee and Jerusalem, and offer a characteristic trait which distinguishes the mass of Galilæan followers from the closer circle of the Apostles.

(b) Differences as to our Lord's Person.

It is not necessary to examine at length the last objection, which rests on the twofold view of the Lord's Person given in the Gospels. So far as the differences on which this is based have any real existence, they have been already noticed. They belong to the essence of supplementary records of Christ's life. They are recognized in the Creeds as well as in the Bible. And all the circumstances connected with the fuller revelation of his glory were calculated to call it forth. The time, the persons, the occasion, were suited for the teaching of the greater mysteries which must have been taught if Christianity is true. And there is a proportion preserved between the communication of the doctrine and the record of it which harmonizes with the general character of Scripture. The deeper truth was committed not to the multitude, but to the few; and the writing in which it is preserved was not the common witness of the Church, but the testimony of a loved disciple.

2. Points of coincidence.

The consideration of the differences between the Synoptists and St. John has already led to the notice of some of their coincidences.

1 Matt. xi. 25—30. Luke x. 21—24.

2 John x. 1—13; xv. 1—6; xii. 24; xvi. 21. John xiii. 4—12. Compare John iii. 29 with Matt. ix. 15.

It is worthy of notice that our Lord is represented as veiling the great mystery of His death under symbolic language both in St. John and in the Synoptists: John iii. 14; Matt. xii. 40; John ii. 20; Luke xiii. 32. For a still earlier revelation of the same truth, compare John i. 29 with Luke ii. 35.

Compare p. 273 n. 5.

These extend to facts, to teaching, and to character; and contribute in no slight degree to invest the fourth Gospel with those attributes of reality and life, which are too commonly lost sight of in the discussion of its peculiar characteristics.

(a) In fact.

The manner in which St. John alludes to some of the cardinal points of our Lord's life, illustrates the usage of the Synoptists with regard to the lapse of time which takes place in their history. He assumes as known that which he nowhere specifies. His full meaning is first perceived when contemplated in the light of facts which are only recorded by others. Though he does not relate in the course of his narrative the details of the Incarnation, the Baptism, the Last Supper, or the Ascension, yet he gives peculiar and unequivocal intimations of each event.

The Incarnation.

The first statement of the Incarnation is absolute; it stands as a vast truth apart from all relation to individuals.[1] But at the beginning of our Lord's ministry, before He had "manifested forth His glory," "the mother of Jesus" looked to Him in perfect dependence on His power, now that He had commenced His public ministry and gathered His disciples round Him.[2] The life of "subjection," which was at length closed, explains the nature of her request; and the critical character of the moment is brought out yet more distinctly in the answer, "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" which places in the clearest contrast the freedom of spiritual action and the claims of private duty. The history of the Infancy and the first miracle at Cana mutually explain each other. An act which is related by one Evangelist carries out the thoughts which are noticed by another.[3] Perfect independence issues in perfect har-

1 John i. 14, ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο.

2 John ii. 1 ff. St. John alone of the Evangelists does not mention the name of "the Mother of the Lord." It is a point full of instruction to compare the phrase (ii. 4). τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί γύναι, with the corresponding words from the cross (xix. 26), Γύναι, ἴδε ὁ υἱός σου, as St. John stood by, ready to "take her to his own home."

3 Luke ii. 51.

mony. In another aspect of the same great fact St. John dwells on the doctrine, while the Synoptists detail the events. St. Matthew and St. Luke narrate at length the history of the Miraculous Conception, and St. John dwells with especial fulness on the eternal Sonship of Christ, which is its divine correlative. The two truths must stand or fall together; for a Cerinthian mean can never express that union of God and man, which is alone sufficient to assure our hearts of redemption.

The Baptism.

If we pass from the Incarnation to the Baptism, we find in this also the same silence and the same implied knowledge of the circumstances of the occurrence. When John the Baptist first appears, his great work is done. The Christ is recognized. When Jesus comes, as it appears, from the scene of the Temptation,[1] he revealed Him to others and witnessed, saying, "I have seen the Holy Spirit descending as a dove from heaven, and it abode upon Him."[2]

The Eucharist: Holy Baptism.

The allusions to the Christian sacraments are equally characteristic, though they are of a different kind. Nothing is said of the institution of the Eucharist or of Holy Baptism, and yet the conversation with Nicodemus[3] and the discourse at Capernaum stand in the closest relation with them, and unfold and enforce the inner meaning of rites with which the Apostle must have been familiar as ordinances of Christ.

The Ascension.

The references to the Ascension are, perhaps, the most remarkable example of the manner in which St. John includes the historical fact in the spiritual necessity of it. He gives at length the discourses

1 This seems to be the natural way of connecting the narratives of St. John and the Synoptists, and to involve no difficulty.

2 The apparent discrepancy between John i. 31 and Matt. iii. 14 disappears when we remember that the fulfilment of John's public mission was to be indicated by a definite sign (John i. 31—35), and thus his personal knowledge (Matt. iii. 14, 15) was independent of his power of prophetic recognition (John i. 31).

3 iii. 5. Cf. [Mark] xvi. 16; Acts ii. 38.

in which the need and the consequences of the event are explained at full; after the Resurrection, he records the remarkable address of our Lord to Mary, in which it is contemplated as an immediate occurrence; and yet he says nothing of the fulfilment of the promise.[1] It is enough that the fact was a part of the divine order. As such for him it *was*, and his readers knew from other sources how it took[2] place.[3]

(b) In teaching.

The marked distinction between the teaching of our Lord in St. John and in the Synoptists has been recognized most fully; but it has been shown that there are points of connection by which the two are in some degree united. This connection admits of being presented somewhat more in detail, in regard of the substance as well as of the manner of the teaching. There is, indeed, something of characteristic difference

1 John xx. 17. With this may be compared the fact that while St. John gives most fully the Discourse on the Mission of the Comforter, St. Luke records the descent of the Holy Spirit (Acts ii.), though he does not notice the antecedent promise. So again, St. John alone notices the special commission of the Apostles (xx. 21, 22. Cf. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20), which is afterwards seen to be realized in the history of the Church.

In illustration of the usage of St. John it may be remarked that St. Paul presupposes the mystery of the Incarnation without expressly stating it: Rom. i. 4; ix. 5. Gal. iv. 4, 5; and includes the Ascension in the Resurrection: 1 Thess. i. 10. The Pauline teaching of the second Adam (1 Cor. xv. 45) may also be compared with John iii. 6.

2 At the one meeting-point of all the Gospels before the history of the Passion (John vi. 1 ff. and parallel accounts) their harmony is perfect. The recurrence of κόφινος, which is only used in the account of this miracle in the New Testament, in all the narratives is worthy of notice.

Among other facts which St. John mentions incidentally as well-known are the calling of "the twelve" (ἐκλέξασθαι, John vi. 70. Cf. Luke vi. 13): the difference between our Lord's birthplace and place of abode (John vii. 42): His relation to Joseph (i. 46; vi. 42).

3 This clear presupposition of an accurate acquaintance with the facts of the life of Christ, which is shown in these minute references, and penetrates the whole Gospel, has two important bearings, which, although necessarily connected, yet refer to different lines of thought. In detail it tends to establish the minute truth of the events recorded by the Evangelists; and more generally, by showing that the spiritual aspect of the evangelic facts was revealed at a time when the simple narratives were already current, it refutes the theory of an imaginary history invented to supply a mental want. The truth lay in the facts; but the facts were accepted in themselves before their inner meaning was laid open.

both in the conception and in the expression of the same truths, but such that the difference contributes to the completeness of the final idea. Thus, in St. Matthew the crowning doctrine of the Holy Trinity is expressed in the formula of Baptism; in St. John it is contemplated in the personal relation of the Christian to the Father and the Son and the Comforter.[1] The mystery of the Atonement lies at the bottom of many of our Lord's last words to His disciples, but it nowhere is stated with such simple distinctness as in the phrase recorded by St. Matthew and St. Mark, in which it is said that "the Son of man came . . . . to give His life a ransom for many."[2] In the Synoptists, no less than in St. John, Christ claims for Himself the possession of "all power,"[3] the forgiveness of sins, the sole revelation of the Father.[4] In both there are traces of the same images, of the same thoughts, of the same language.[5] And it is most important to observe that St. John nowhere attributes to our Lord the key-words of

1 Matt. xxviii. 19; John xv. xvi. xvii.

2 Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45 (λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν). The word λύτρον is not found elsewhere in the New Testament. Ἀντίλυτρον occurs 1 Tim. ii. 6.

3 Matt. xxviii. 18. Cf. xxii. 41—46.

4 Matt. xi. 27.

5 The following examples will be sufficient to justify what is said:

1. Coincidences in Imagery.

John iii. 3 (the new birth); Matt. xviii. 3 (become as little children).

John iv. 35; Matt. ix. 37 (the great harvest).

John xiii. 1 ff.; Luke xii. 37 (the Master serving). Cf. Luke xxii. 27.

John xiii. 16; Matt. x. 24, 25 (the master and servant).

John iii. 29; Matt. xxii. 2 (the bridegroom).

2. Coincidences in Thought.

John v. 14; Matt. xii. 43—45 (the worse thing).

John ix. 39; Matt. xiii. 13. Cf. John xii. 40 (the eyes blinded).

John xiii. 20; Matt. x. 40 (the Father received by the faithful).

John v. 30; Matt. xxvi. 39 (the Father's will done).

John iii. 17; Luke ix. 56 (the mission to save).

John vii. 29; x. 15; Matt. xi. 27 (the Father known to Christ).

3. Coincidences in Language.

John iv. 44; Matt. xiii. 57 (the prophet without honor).

John xii. 25; Luke xvii. 33 (the soul loved and lost).

John v. 8; Mark ii. 9 (the words of healing).

To these may be added the parallel reports of the judgment of the people: John iv. 19; Luke vii. 16—John vi. 42; Matt. xiii. 55—John vii. 15; Matt. xiii. 54. And while the Synoptists (Matt. xxvi. 61) mention the special charge against the Lord of speaking against the Temple, St. John alone gives the words which led to the charge (John ii. 19. Cf. Matt. xii. 6).

his own terminology. In his Gospel, as in the others, Christ speaks of Himself as "the Son" or "the Son of man," and never as "the Word."[1]

(c) In character.

One other point of coincidence between the Synoptists and St. John still remains to be noticed, — the coincidence of the characters which they describe. The scene varies, the manner varies, the substance (in some sense) varies, but the great figures who give life to the picture are the same. This kind of resemblance, which in fiction is one of the subtlest refinements of art, in such writings as the Gospels is a clear sign of absolute truth. Where it cannot spring from elaborate design, it must be the result of faithful portraiture.

The character of the Lord.

It has been often and most truly said that the character of our Lord, as drawn by the Evangelists, is in itself the one sufficient proof of their veracity. No character could have been further removed from the popular ideal of the time; none more entirely beyond the conception of men reared amidst dreams of national hope, and checked at every step by the signs of foreign power. A natural awe commonly hinders us from picturing to ourselves the Person of our blessed

1 John iii. 10—21, and 27—33, might at first sight seem exceptions to this remark. Yet, on a careful reading of the passages, it seems impossible not to feel that the Evangelist is in part commenting on and explaining the testimony which he records. The comments seem to begin respectively at verses 16 and 31. These additions will seem less singular if we remember that they set forth the spiritual essence of Christianity in relation to the legal righteousness and to the preparatory mission of the Baptist.

These explanatory comments receive a striking illustration from a single phrase introduced into John xvii. 3. The title Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς in such a connection is wholly without parallel in the Gospels; and we must, I think, regard τὸν μ. ἀλ. Θεὸν and I. Χρ. as explanations of the preceding, added by the Evangelist, which do not *modify* but only *define* the sense. Cf. 1 John v. 20. The title *Jesus Christ* is commonly given to our Lord in the Acts and Epistles, but occurs only in the introductions to the Gospels: Matt. i. 1, 16, 18; Mark i. 1; John i. 17, or, in other words, in those sections which formed no part of the original tradition. This peculiarity is important, as showing the two stages in the history of the Gospels, though it will not bear out the conclusion which Dr. Dobbin (Davidson, *Introd.* i. 421 ff.) drew from it, as to the priority of the Gospels in their *present form* to the Epistles. Cf. pp. 211 ff.

Lord with any individual distinctness. In one sense it is true that He has no individuality, for the aspects of His human nature are practically infinite; but we do not even apprehend His character individually in the different lights in which it is presented. The mind shrinks from analysis, lest criticism should take the place of devotion; and yet there is a sense in which even we may "see Christ in the flesh," and strengthen our faith by the contemplation of those traits of a divine humanity, which furnish for all ages the perfect type of life. Touching only on one small border of this subject, we may notice some features in the character of our Lord which are traced both in the Synoptists and St. John. The variety of the circumstances establishes the truthfulness of the impression, and helps to present the Saviour to us, not as a mere embodiment of an idea, as some have taught, but moving in a world of action, and influenced by the complex feelings to which we are subject. At the beginning and the close of His work, St. John, as we have already seen,[1] shows how He drew a line between natural and spiritual claims; so in the Synoptists, "He stretched forth His hand to His disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren," when, for a moment, His earthly kindred sought to interrupt His work of mercy.[2] By the well at Sychar He sat down "wearied," and then forgot His request and His fatigue in conversing with the Samaritan, so that "His disciples prayed Him, saying, Master, eat. But He said unto them, I have meat to eat that ye know not of."[3] And so again, after He had retired into the wilderness with His disciples, for "they had no leisure so much as to eat," when He saw much people, He "was moved with compassion toward them, and began to teach them many things."[4] In each case the same bodily want is recognized, and in each case it yields to the pressure of a higher desire. The Jews, when they

1 p. 292, n. 2.

2 Matt. xii. 46 ff.; Mark iv. 32 ff.; Luke viii. 19.

3 John iv. 6, 7, 31 ff.

4 Mark vi. 31 ff. Cf. Mark iii. 20.

saw His acts of authority, said unto Him, "What sign showest Thou unto us, seeing that Thou doest these things? Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." "An evil and adulterous generation," He said, in another place, "seeketh after a sign; and there shall be no sign given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas."[1] In both cases the manner, the thought, the lesson, is the same. We feel that both are utterances of the same Person, and yet such that no mere power of imitation could have passed from one to the other. John, when in prison, sent to ask Christ, "Art Thou He that should come, or do we look for another? Jesus answered, ... Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see." "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin. . . . . If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin."[2] The testimony of word and deed, that is enough to reassure the last prophet who would have hastened, it may be, the glory of Christ's kingdom, and to condemn those who "had seen and hated both Him and His Father." A short sentence from the lips of One who "knew what was in man" lays open the whole inner life and brings to its final issue the struggle which divides it, whether of faithful repentance, as, when He said, "Go, call thy husband," or of sad abandonment, as, when He gave the command to him whom He loved, "Go thy way, sell whatever thou hast, and give to the poor."[3] Nicodemus, when he seemed to claim for himself the gift of wise discernment, was met by the answer, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." When the disciples disputed "Who is the greatest," Jesus set a little child in the midst of them, and said, "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."[4] The

1 John ii. 19; Matt. xii. 39.

2 Matt. xi. 4; John xv. 24.

3 John iv. 16; Mark x. 21.

4 John iii. 3 (οἴδαμεν, ver. 2); Matt. xviii. 1 ff.

multitude crowded round Him in wild anger, and "He hid Himself, and going through the midst of them so passed by," if, perhaps, their sin might be yet averted.[1] The same simple words, "Follow me," mark the discipleship of Philip in St. John, which elsewhere determine the call of Matthew.[2] The over-zealous request of St. Peter was anticipated by a question which reproved his zeal, and in the same way the salutation of Nathanael seems to have replied to the doubts with which his mind was filled.[3] In St. John, as in the Synoptists, the dealing of our Lord with those who came to Him is everywhere marked by the same absolute insight, so that His words were the touchstone by which their thoughts were revealed. Love is blended with judgment, and the voice of encouragement with the call to faith, in a way which finds no parallel in history. The image is divine, and bears witness to a divine prototype.

The character of St. Peter.

The vastness of the character of the Lord is best seen by contrast with any of the other characters in the Gospels. These, however noble, are yet limited, and capable of being realized in a definite form. Every one has a distinct conception of St. Peter and St. John. They have an individuality which, in this sense, our Lord could not have; and St. Peter, above all, is the one in whom this is most marked. Quick in action even to rashness, and bold in word even to presumption, he is yet the founder of the outward Church. In St. John, and in the Synoptists, the essential outlines of his character answer to the symbolic name which all the Evangelists notice as given to him by Christ;[4] and several

1 John viii. 59; Luke iv. 30.

2 John i. 43 (cf. xxi. 19); Matt. ix. 9 (cf. viii. 22). Compare also the δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου, Matt. iv. 19.

3 Matt. xvii. 25; John i. 47, 48.

4 John i. 42, Σὺ εἶ Σίμων ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωάνου· σὺ κληθήσῃ Κηφᾶς ὃ ἑρμηνεύεται Πέτρος. This prophetic naming (κληθήσῃ) may have been repeated at the commission of the Twelve, though there is nothing in the language used in describing that event which necessarily leads to that conclusion (Matt. x. 2, Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος. Luke iii. 16, καὶ ἐπέθηκε ὄνομα τῷ Σ. Πέτρον. Luke vi. 14, ὃν καὶ ὠνόμασε

corresponding traits may be placed together so as to show the real unity which lies beneath the different narratives. In the first two Gospels it is related that when our Lord began to speak of His coming sufferings at Jerusalem, "Peter took Him and began to rebuke Him, saying, Be it far from Thee, Lord: this shall not be unto Thee." In St. John, when at the last supper Christ served His disciples, and girded Himself to wash their feet, "Peter saith unto Him, Thou shalt never wash my feet."[1] He cannot for a moment endure the thought of the humiliation of his Lord, whether among His enemies or His own followers; and if he adds afterwards with the overhaste of a natural reaction: "Lord, not my feet only, but also my head and my hands;" it is, as when at the Transfiguration, he would have "built three tabernacles" for Christ and Moses and Elias, "not knowing what he said," but eager to realize to the full a blessing of which he only half perceived the import, and unable to wait in calm assurance on the will of His Master.[2] This impatient energy, which seems to be ever striving after the issues of things, made him give expression in many cases to the thoughts which others cherished, perhaps vaguely.[3] Thus it was in his noble confession of Christ's divine majesty, in which St. John has preserved one trait of singular interest. According to the details which he has recorded, the confession itself was connected with action: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words (*ῥήματα*) of eternal life,"[4] and in virtue of this

Πέτρον). St. Mark uses the same phrase of the title of the sons of Zebedee: *καὶ ἐπέθηκεν αὐτοῖς ὀνόματα Βοανεργές*, a title which evidently points to some special fact, which can hardly have been connected with their appointment to the Apostolate. The contrast between John i. 42, *σὺ εἶ Σίμων* and the phrase preserved by St. Matthew in the record of the confession is very striking: Matt. xvi. 17, *σὺ εἶ Πέτρος*. The prophecy was then fulfilled.

1 Matt. xvi. 21 ff.; Mark viii. 31 ff.; John xiii. 8.

2 John xiii. 9; Matt. xvii. 4; Mark ix. 5, 6; Luke ix. 33.

3 This is seen in several little traits: Mark xi. 21, *ἀναμνησθεὶς ὁ Π. λέγει*. Matt. xxi. 20, *ἰδόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐθαύμασαν*. Luke viii. 45, *εἶπεν ὁ Π. καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ*. Mark v. 31, *ἔλεγον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτῷ*.

4 John vi. 68, 69. The words are the true complement of Luke v. 8. Cf. Matt. xvi. 17; Mark viii. 29; Luke ix. 20.

practical power he received the special charge: "Do thou when thou art converted strengthen thy brethren."[1] Elsewhere he would know of the future of himself or others: "Behold, we forsook all and followed Thee, what shall we have therefore?"[2] "Lord, and what shall this man do?" He cannot rest in uncertainty where knowledge might prove the guide to deeds. If the Lord spoke of "blind leaders," he said, "Declare unto us this parable;" if of watchful service, "Lord, speakest Thou this parable unto (*πρός*) us, or even unto all?" if of a traitor among the Apostles, he beckoned to "the disciple who leaned on Jesus' bosom," "Tell who it is of whom He speaks;"[3] if of a coming separation, "Lord, why cannot I follow Thee now?"[4] Frequently the characteristics of St. Peter are seen in action. Now he would pay the Temple tribute for Christ, as jealous for His ritual "righteousness;" now he follows Him "with a sword" to Gethsemane.[5] We feel at once that the walking on the waters and the failing faith are a true figure of his following Christ to the place of judgment and then denying Him.[6] Then follows the swift

1 Luke xxii. 32 f. *σύ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας.*

2 Matt. xix. 27. Cf. Mark x. 28. Luke xviii. 28.

3 John xxi. 21, *Κύριε οὗτος δὲ τί.*

4 Matt. xv. 15; Luke xii. 41; John xiii. 24 (Cf. p. 269, n. 1): John xiii. 37. Compare the question, Matt. xviii. 21: "Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him?"

5 Matt. xvii. 24; John xviii. 10.

6 Matt. xiv. 28; xxvi. 35, and parallels. Much discussion has been raised as to the narratives of the denial of St. Peter, and the differences which occur in them are generally insisted upon as offering the clearest proof of the impossibility of maintaining the *verbal* accuracy of the Evangelists. A comparison of the texts in question rather creates surprise that difficulty should have been felt by any who picture the scene as it may be supposed to have happened.

All the Evangelists fix the place as the same, "the court of the High Priest" (*ἡ αὐλὴ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως*, Matt. xxvi. 58; Mark xiv. 54; Luke xxii. 54, 55; John xviii. 16, 17). The narrative of St. John, which distinguishes a hearing before Annas from the hearing before Caiaphas, yet clearly implies that all the denials were made in the same spot (xviii. 18, 25). From this fact, connected with Luke xxii. 61, etc., it seems probable that "the house of the High Priest" included the official apartments of Annas and Caiaphas. (Cf. Strauss, § 127.)

But it is said, the persons who provoke Peter to the denial are differently given. This requires careful notice. (1) All the Evangelists agree that the first question was put by "a damsel"

and complete reaction. St. John first looks into the empty sepulchre, but St. Peter first enters it.[1] St. John first recognizes the risen Lord on the sea of Tiberias, but St. Peter first casts himself into the water to be with Him.[2] Perfect truthfulness alone can account for the minute harmony of all the features in such a character, portrayed in books most widely separated in origin and date.

The character of St. John.

More difficulty has been felt in combining into one picture the various traits which have been recorded of the person of St. John. He is but rarely mentioned in the Synoptists, and a mighty revolution was interposed between these earlier notices and the testimonies of his own writings. Besides this the character itself is one which almost eludes description. The intense concentration and power of an inner life flashes out at some rare moments, but commonly the life flows on with deep and still course. St. John was,

(Matt. xxvi. 69, μία παιδίσκη. Mark xiv. 66, μία τῶν παιδισκῶν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως. Luke xxii. 56, παιδίσκη τις. John xviii. 17, ἡ παιδίσκη ἡ θυρωρὸς). St. John adds that she was "the portress," St. Luke that the question was put as St. Peter "sat by the fire;" so far all is perfectly harmonious, for I do not notice the variations in the words of the question, which are Greek renderings of the Aramaic, and perfectly agree in sense. (2) In the narrative of the second denial the persons who assail St. Peter are variously given. St. Matthew (71) says "another woman" (ἄλλη); St. Mark (69) "the same damsel" (ἡ παιδίσκη); St. Luke (58) "another man" (ἕτερος); St. John (25) simply, "they said" (εἶπον). The phrase of St. John brings the whole scene before us as the others describe it in detail. A crowd is gathered round the fire (John xviii. 18); the portress tells her suspicions to the bystanders (Mark xiv. 69); the accusation is repeated by various persons, and St. Peter left the group (Matt. xxvi. 71, ἐξελθόντα εἰς τὸν πυλῶνα), repeating his hasty denial (Mark xiv. 70, ἠρνεῖτο. No one uses the imperfect in the former case). (3) This most natural conception of the event is further brought out on the third denial. St. Luke (59) says, "another said, Of a truth this fellow also was with Him; for he is a Galilæan." St. John (26), "One of the servants of the High Priest, being his kinsman whose ear Peter cut off, saith, Did not I see thee in the garden with Him?" Here St. Matthew and St. Mark notice the number of the assailants: "they that stood by said" (Matt. xxvi. 73, οἱ ἑστῶτες εἶπον. Mark xiv. 70, οἱ παρεστῶτες ἔλεγον). The narratives present us with three acts of denial, as they may be most naturally supposed to have taken place in a crowded court, in the excitement of a popular ferment.

On the conduct of St. Peter himself Luthardt has some good remarks: *a. a. O.* 108 ff.

1 John xx. 6.

2 John xxi. 7.

indeed, a "Son of Thunder,"[1] but the thunder is itself the unfrequent witness of the might of elements long gathering. There is a difference between the style of St. John and that which we should assign to the Galilæan apostle, but the style is only the reflection of his completed character. There is the difference between a former and a latter faith, such as we find also between the recorded acts and epistles of St. Peter; but in the Apocalypse, and the Catholic letters of St. John, we trace the identity of his nature in the course of its development. The same zeal which would have called *fire from heaven* on the inhospitable Samaritans, though guided now to another end, denounces *plagues and destruction on him who takes from or adds to the words of his prophecy.*[2] The same jealousy for Christ which forbade the working of one who *followed not with them*, though purified by a higher faith, warns the elect lady not *to bid God speed to him who abideth not in the doctrine.*[3] The same fervent spirit in defence of truth is, as has been seen, recognized by tradition, and that, too, combined with the tenderest love.[4] Nor is there any inconsistency in such a combination. The same deep feeling is the source of both characteristics. And as the affectionate letters to the Philippians and to Timothy, with their clearer revelations of divine truth, only unfold to us another view of the great Apostle, so the Gospel of St. John, in its fulness of meditative devotion, helps us to realize the whole Christian course of him who first, with eager hope, acknowledged in Jesus the *Lamb of God*, and saw *in the Spirit* of God farthest into the history of the Church, and guarded most jealously its early creed.[5] Throughout the whole life of St. John, — in Samaria, in Patmos, in Ephesus, in the old world of Judaism, in the new world of Christianity,

1 The *form* of the surname is well explained by Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr. ad Marc.* iii. 17; the general sense by Meyer, and most recent commentators on the passage.

2 Luke ix. 45; Apoc. xxii. 18.

3 Luke ix. 49; 2 John, 9, 10.

4 Cf. p. 234 f.

5 John i. 35—37; Apoc. i. 10.

and in that meeting-point of the two dispensations, which was the fiery trial of the early Church; in the most distant times, and in the most diverse lands, we ever find the same personal devotion to the Lord, as the embodiment of the Divine, — alike distinguished from the zeal of St. Peter for His outward glory, and the energy of St. Paul for His extended influence, — enlightened, indeed, and spiritualized by the growth of Christianity in himself and in the world, and yet unchanged. The youthful, womanly form, which art has assigned to St. John, has served to remove from our minds the stronger features of his nature. Yet these may not be forgotten, for even in this aspect the eagle is his true symbol. His love was no soft feeling, but a living principle, an absolute devotion to truth, as he had seen and known it in the Person of his Lord. He stands forth as the ideal of a thoughtful Christian, relentless against evil, and yet patient with the doubting. He "tarried till the Lord came," and left his Gospel as the witness and seal of the accomplishment of the apostolic work.[1]

St. John's Gospel in relation to a new world.

From this point of sight the new scope of his Gospel answered to the conditions of a new world. The period which intervened between the dates of the Synoptic Gospels and St. John's was, beyond any other, full of the *distress of nations with perplexity*, and marked by the *shaking of the powers of heaven*, which proved, so to speak, to be the birth-pains of the Christian Church.[2] When St. John wrote, the Jews were *led away captive into*

Judaism.

1 There is not space now to dwell on the other characters traced in St. John, but one general remark must be made. The number of distinct persons portrayed by him is a singular mark of the authenticity of his narrative. In the Synoptic Gospels no one stands out from the Apostles except St. Peter, and perhaps the sons of Zebedee, but in St. John we have characteristic traits of St. Andrew (i. 41 ff.; vi. 8, 9; xii. 22), St. Philip (i. 44 ff.; vi. 5; xii. 21 ff. xiv. 8 f.), St. Thomas (xi. 16; xiv. 5; xx. 24 ff.), St. Jude (xiv. 22). The parallel between Luke x. 39 ff. with John xi. has been often drawn.

2 Luke xxi. 25, 26. Cf. Tac. *Hist.* i. 2, 3. Sometimes the language of the historian coincides verbally with Scripture: Præter multiplices rerum humanarum casus, *cœlo terraque prodigia* et fulminum monitus.

all nations,[1] and men asked why God had cast away His people? what there was in the Gospel-history which explained the rejection of the seed of Abraham, of whom, *as concerning the flesh, Christ came?*

Christianity, *as a system.*

On another side, St. Paul had given to Christianity its intellectual development. He had completed the work which St. Peter had begun, and maintained the freedom of the Gentile converts who had been first received by the Apostle of the Circumcision. The storm which had raged from Jerusalem to Pontus, from Antioch to Rome, had now ceased, but the fashion of the Church was changed, and men asked what ground there was in the teaching of the Messiah for this new form of Christianity?

Acts x. 47.

Philosophy.

Col. iv. 13.

And yet again, Christianity had come into contact with Philosophy. The voice of the preacher had been heard in Alexandria by the scholars of Philo, and at Hierapolis by the friends of Epictetus; and many must have inquired how far the new doctrines served to unfold the inner life of man? how far they fulfilled the aspirations of the Academy, and realized the morality of the Porch.

The life of the Lord explaining the rejection of the Jews as a nation:

To all these deep questionings, unencountered for the most part by the former Evangelists, who regarded rather the outward form of the Christian faith than its rational or spiritual development, St. John replies by the teaching of the Lord's Life. The Jews, as a nation, had rejected the Saviour: *He came to His own, and His own received Him not.*[2] Throughout the whole ministry of Christ, as recorded in the fourth Gospel, the progress of this wilful blindness is traced, till the record closes with the fatal sentence: *Though Jesus had done so many miracles before them, yet the Jews believed not on Him; as Esaias prophesied when he saw His glory, and spake of Him.*[3]

1 Luke xxi. 24.

2 John i. 11 (τὰ ἴδια, οἱ ἴδιοι).

3 John i. 11; xii. 37—41. Cf. p. 279. One peculiarity of St. John's lan-

Christian doctrine.

Nor are the great doctrines on which St. Paul delighted to dwell, — the doctrines of faith, of love, of providence, of a redemption, of a Holy Spirit, — brought out less distinctly by St. John than the fall of the Jews.[1] It is true that we can trace these great elements of Christianity in the symbolic teaching of the Synoptists, and in scattered sayings; but they form the staple of St. John's narrative. The lesson is at least coördinate with the fact; and the plain revela-

guage in this view is to be noticed. He speaks of the opponents of the Lord almost always as "the Jews" (οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι), which phrase is never used by the Synoptists in this sense, who employ the specific terms, "the Pharisees," etc. St. John uses the term "the Pharisees" frequently in a definite sense (i. 24; iv. 1, etc.), but never "the scribes" (John viii. 3 is even on this account to be condemned), "the lawyers," "the Sadducees." The Synoptists, on the other hand, only put the title "the Jews" in the mouth of Gentiles: Matt. ii. 2; Matt. xxvii. 11 ff. and parallels, with very rare exceptions, where they add notes, as it were, to the original narrative: Matt. xxviii. 15; Mark vii. 3; Luke vii. 3; xxiii. 51 (though these two last instances are more remarkable). St. John regards the nation after its final apostasy, and the distinctions of party are lost in their common unbelief. It seems strange that some commentators should have grounded an objection on this "undesigned coincidence" between the scope and the language of the Gospel. The usage of St. Luke in *the Acts* naturally agrees with that of St. John.

Some alleged historical difficulties will be noticed afterwards in Chap. VIII.

1 It would carry us too far to do more than allude to the parallel which may be drawn between St. John and St. Paul on these great topics. The following hints may suggest a line of inquiry:

a. Faith. Never the abstract πίστις, but always active as πιστεύειν εἰς, a transference of our hope to another and not a mere assent to a fact, πιστεύειν τινι, a construction which occurs commonly in this sense (iv. 21, 50, etc.). Thus the act of faith appears as the ground of sonship (i. 12), life (iii. 15, etc.; xi. 25, 26, etc.), support (vi. 35), inspiration (vii. 38), guidance (xii. 36, 46), power (xiv. 12), "the work of God" (vi. 29). In the Synoptists "faith" (πίστις) is the mediative energy in material deliverances (Matt. ix. 22; Mark v. 34; x. 52; Luke vii. 50; viii. 48; xvii. 19; xviii. 42), as the types of higher deliverance, and the measure of material power (Matt. ix. 29; xxi. 21; Mark xi. 22).

b. Love. John xiii. 34; xv. 12. (Contrast Matt. xxii. 39). 1 Cor. xiii.

c. Providence. "Predestination." John vi. 64, 65; iii. 27; vi. 37, 44; v. 21; xv. 16 (cf. vi. 70); xv. 5; xvii. 12. In this connection ἡ ὥρα, of the crisis in each stage of our Lord's Life, and specially of His Passion, as its crowning point: ii. 4; vii. 30; viii. 20; xii. 23, 27; xiii. 1; xvi. 4; xvii. 1. Cf. ὁ καίρος, vii. 6–8.

d. Redemption. i. 29; iii. 14, 15; vi. 51; xii. 24; xiii. 31. Comp. Rom. v. 8 with John iii. 16.

e. The division in man. i. 13. Comp. Rom. vii. 6 with John iii. 6, and John vi. 63 with 2 Cor. iii. 6.

tions which he made, as he recorded the deep words on which he had long pondered, furnish the means of recognizing the actual fulness of the other Gospels. Without St. John, it might seem possible to say, with a recent writer, "Not Paul but Jesus;" but with him, the unity of the New Testament is vindicated, and the chain of its connection finished.

Human thought.

The intimate connection of St. John's Gospel with the greatest problems of thought and life has never been questioned. A few words are sufficient to show that the Apostle had felt that there are mysteries beyond all human understanding; and he was contented to state them in the simplicity of antithetic truths. From the first consecration of social intercourse at the Marriage Feast to the last utterances of a Master's love, the course of spiritual life and death is traced in its progressive stages, as the words and works of the Lord are recorded, year by year, advancing together in ever-widening spheres to their final consummation. The sublime prayer of Plato[1] is answered by that Word which *abides in us and we in Him.* The possibility of the true life, of which Stoicism was but a counterfeit, is secured by the promised Comforter, through Whom we *shall do the works which Christ did, and greater works than these, because He has gone to the Father.*[2]

John xv. 7.

John xiv. 12.

This was the teaching from the Life of Christ which was required by the age at which St. John wrote, and it has been seen that he was peculiarly fitted to supply it. His early call to the Apostleship enabled him to regard

1 Plat. *Phæd.* 85 B: δεῖν γὰρ . . . τὸν βέλτιστον τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων λόγων λαβόντα καὶ δυσελεγκτότατον, ἐπὶ τούτου ὀχούμενον, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ σχεδίας, κινδυνεύοντα διαπλεῦσαι τὸν βίον, εἰ μή τις δύναιτο ἀσφαλέστερον καὶ ἀκινδυνότερον ἐπὶ βεβαιοτέρου ὀχήματος ἢ λόγου θείου τινὸς διαπορευθῆναι.

2 Perhaps it is from looking at the mysterious depths of thought and language, often unintelligible to the thinker and speaker, that St. John records the unconscious testimony of unbelievers: xi. 51; xix. 21, 22; (xviii. 38).

Christianity from a Christian point of sight; he had to experience no sudden conversion, like St. Paul; he had to abandon no ancient prejudices, like St. Peter; his whole nature seems to have been absorbed in the contemplation of the Light, and the Life, and the Truth; and while others wandered on distant missions, it was his work to cherish the Mother of his Lord, to see visions, and to meditate on *what he had heard, and looked upon, and handled, of the Word of Life.* The prophecies which ushered in the new dispensation failed; the tongues which gave utterance to the raptures of the first believers ceased; the knowledge of the early Church vanished before the fuller development of Christianity; but love still remained, and at Ephesus, which combined all the refinement of Greek culture with the freedom of Eastern thought, St. John wrote "the Gospel of the world," resolving reason into intuition, and faith into sight.

1 *John* i. 1.

CHAPTER VI.

THE DIFFERENCES IN DETAIL OF THE SYNOPTIC EVANGELISTS.

Willst du dich am Ganzen erquicken:
So musst du das Ganze im Kleinsten erblicken. — GOETHE.

HITHERTO it has been our object to show that the four Evangelists were naturally fitted to record the Life of Christ, under the different forms in which it met the wants of the early Church and is still apprehended by ourselves. It has been seen that the Apostolic age was marked by the existence of representative types of religious belief; that the Gospel narrative was shaped in the first instance by the pressure of immediate needs, and afterwards reduced to writing under circumstances which tended to perpetuate the characteristics which had been preserved by various classes of the first teachers and hearers; that the fourth is distinguished from the other three, by a difference which is likened to the relation of the spirit to the body, of the universal to the special, or again, of the testimony of the loved disciple to the common testimony of the Church. In the present Chapter we shall examine more minutely the mutual bearings of the synoptic Gospels. With this object we shall review in detail the accounts which they contain of the great crises of the Life of our Lord, in order at once to test more rigorously, and define more clearly, the general view which has been proposed. If it be said that the variations to be alleged can be explained by nat-

ural causes, we at once admit the statement; for it has been shown that one of the elements of Inspiration is the selection of a messenger by God, who shall express truth in its human form with the fulness and force of his proper character. The differences in the Gospels may, and in some sense must, have arisen naturally; but in the same sense the whole working of Providence is natural, and the results of individual feeling in past time have been consecrated for our instruction by the office of the Christian Church.

The mode in which the different Evangelists deal with the history of the Incarnation and Birth of our Lord offers a perfect illustration of their independence and special characteristics. St. Mark, who records the active ministry of Christ, gives no details of His Infancy; and both from internal and external grounds there is reason to believe that in this respect he observed the limits of the first oral Gospel. The narrative of the mysteries of the Nativity belonged to the period of the written testimony, and not of the first proclamation; and St. Matthew and St. Luke combine to reveal as much of the great facts as helps us to apprehend, not the event itself, but the mode in which it was welcomed by those with whom God was pleased to work in its accomplishment. The genealogy with which St. Matthew opens his Gospel introduces at once its peculiar subject.[1] The first words are an echo of Old Testa-

1 The questions involved in the two genealogies of our Lord are so numerous and intricate that it is impossible to enter upon them here. The omission of the discussion is of little consequence, as it has been most ably conducted by Dr. Mill (*The Evangelical Accounts of the Descent and Parentage of the Saviour vindicated*, Cambr. 1842) and by Lord A. Hervey (*The Genealogies of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, Cambr. 1853). A summary of the results which these critics have obtained is given in a little tract, *The Genealogies in St. Matthew and St. Luke*, London, 1856. Without affirming every detail in the explanations proposed, we may be satisfied that every discrepancy *can* be explained; and more than this is not to be expected in a case where necessarily much of the history is most obscure. Both genealogies without doubt give the descent of Joseph, — the universal belief till the sixteenth century, — St. Matthew his *legal* descent, showing that our Lord was Solomon's *heir* (2 Sam. vii. 13—17; 1 Chron. xvii. 14), though

ment language,[1] and the symmetrical arrangement of the generations is equally significant in relation to Jewish history and to Jewish thought. But apart from the form, St. Matthew dates the Messianic hope from David and from Abraham, and binds Christianity with the promises of the ancient covenant.[2] St. Luke, on the contrary, places the corresponding descent not before the Birth but after the Baptism, and represents Christ as the second Adam, "the Son of God."[3] In the one we see a royal Infant born by a legal title to a glorious inheritance; and in the other a ministering Saviour who bears the natural sum of human sorrow. Even in the lines of descent which extend through the period common to the two genealogies there is a characteristic difference: St. Matthew follows the course of the royal inheritance of Solomon, whose natural lineage was closed by the childless Jehoiachim: St. Luke traces through Nathan the natural parentage of "the son of David." In St. Matthew the Birth of Christ is connected with national glories; in St. Luke with pious hopes. Instead of recalling the crises of Jewish history[4] and the majesty of the typical kingdom, the Pauline Evangelist begins his narrative with a full recital of the personal acts of God's mercy to the just and prayerful, and of His all-powerful grace[5] to the holy and believing.[6] In St. Matthew

the line of Solomon failed in Jehoiachim (Jer. xxii. 29, 30), and St. Luke his natural descent, showing that he was *lineally descended* from David (2 Sam. vii. 12; Ps. lxxxix. 35, 36) through Nathan. For the details of the subject I must refer to the works above quoted.

1 Matt. i. 1, *βίβλος γενέσεως*. Cf. Gen. v. 1.

2 Matt. i. 1.

3 "Cum [Lucas] Adamum *Dei filium* vocat, significat Christum ex virgine ortum, secundum esse Adamum, ejusque ortum per Spiritum Sanctum non minus esse opus potentiæ divinæ singulare quam Adami fuerat" (Wetst. *ad Luc.* iii. f.) For a comparison of St. Paul's and Philo's teaching on the second Adam, compare Babington, *Journ. of Philology*, i. pp. 47 ff.

4 Matt. i. 2, 6, 11.

5 The words *χάρις*, *χαρίζομαι*, are not found in St. Matthew or St. Mark. The former occurs in the Introduction of St. John, and in all the groups of the Epistles.

6 Luke i. 6, 13, 28, 45. On the last passage Ambrose says (*In Luc.* ii. § 26), "Quæcunque crediderit anima et concipit et generat Dei Verbum, et opera ejus agnoscit. . . . Si secundum carnem una mater est Christi; secundum fidem tamen omnium fructus est Christus."

we read of the Incarnation as it was revealed in a dream to Joseph, in whom may be seen an emblem of the ancient people; but in St. Luke the mystery is announced by "the mighty one of God"[1] to the Blessed Virgin, the type of the Christian Church.[2] In St. Matthew the Nativity is ushered in by prophecy; in St. Luke it is heralded by those songs of triumphant faith which have been rehearsed in our public services for thirteen centuries; and even these, from hymn to hymn, seem to gather fulness and love: the "help of Israel" and the "horn of David" is welcomed as one who shall bring "joy to all the chosen nation," and give "light to the Gentiles." In St. Luke the shepherds, — the humble watchers of nature, — the despised successors of the patriarchs,[3] — cheered by the voice of angels, recognize and proclaim the praises of the Saviour[4] of the meek in heart; and the devotion first offered in the stable of the village inn is completed by the thanksgivings of the aged Simeon and Anna in the Temple: in St. Matthew the Magi, — the wise inquirers

The same writer points out in a word the difference between Zachariah and the Blessed Virgin (*In Luc.* ii. § 15): "Hæc jam de negotio tractat: ille adhuc de nuntio dubitat."

1 *Gabriel:* Luke i. 19. Cf. Dan. viii. 16: ix. 21.

2 Ambr. *In Luc.* ii. § 7. It has been argued (even by Neander, *L. J.* § 14, *n.*) that the different modes in which God is recorded to have communicated with man, in St. Matthew by dreams, and in St. Luke by angels, show the extent of the subjective influence of the writer's mind upon the narrative. But surely those are right who see in this difference the use of various means adapted to the peculiar state of the recipient. Moreover, as St. Matthew recognizes the ministry of Angels (xxviii. 2), so St. Luke relates Visions (Acts x. 9—16; xvi. 9; xviii. 9, 10). Cf. Gen. xx. 3; xxviii. 12; xxxi. 24 (Dreams) — xviii. 2; xix. 1 (Angels). With regard to the names of the angels it may be observed that the adoption of foreign terms does not imply the introduction of a foreign belief. Cf. p. 78.

It is to be noticed that the contents of the divine messages (Matt. i. 20, 21; Luke i. 30—33) are related conversely to the general character of the Gospels, as a consequence of the difference of character in those to whom they were addressed. The promise of Redemption is made to Joseph; of a glorious kingdom to the Virgin.

3 "Abba Garien dixit . . . ne doceat quisquam filium suum . . . pastorem . . . eo quod opificium ipserum est opificium latronum" (Wetst. *in Luc.* ii. 8).

4 The words σωτήρ (Cic. *In Verr.* ii. 63), σωτηρία, σωτήριος, are not found in St. Matthew and St. Mark. They occur John iv. 42, 22; 1 John iv. 14. The progression in Luke ii. 18—20 is very beautiful: wonder — meditation — praise.

into the mysteries of the world, — led by a strange portent in the sky, *offer adoration*[1] and symbolic tribute to the new-born *king of the Jews*. In the one we read of the fulfilment of the Jewish idea of a royal Messiah: in the other, the realization of the cravings, clear or indistinct, of the human heart. In the one we see typified the universal reign of Christ, and in the other His universal mercy. Once more, St. Matthew alone records the murder of the Innocents, the flight into Egypt, the cause of the final settlement at Nazareth; St. Luke, on the other hand, has preserved the details of the Purification, and adds the one incident which links together the Infancy and the Ministry of Christ in the trait of a perfect obedience and a divine consciousness.[2] In the former the hostility of earthly powers to the kingdom of Christ is seen to work out the designs of God; in the latter the law is fulfilled in the redemption of the Saviour from the service of the Jewish Temple.

This contrast in detail the sign of a contrast in general character.

The consideration of these various details will show the reality of the difference in spirit and form between the two narratives; but the artificiality of the contrast lessens the sense of their complementary character throughout. It is impossible to read them in succession without feeling that we pass from one aspect of the great central fact to

1 The word προσκυνεῖν is not applied by St. Luke to our Lord till after the Resurrection: xxiv. 52, where also it is probably an interpolation. Cf. p. 330, n. 2.

2 A comparison of Matt. ii. 11 with Luke ii. 24 (Levit. xii. 8) leads us to place the Purification before the Visit of the Magi. Luke ii. 39 does not *exclude* the flight into Egypt, and certainly shows the independence of the Evangelists. Nor does there appear to be any discrepancy between Matt. ii. 22, 23 and Luke ii. 4. The divine command (Matt. ii. 20) would suggest a return to Bethlehem, in which such marvellous things had been wrought; and how can we account for Joseph's selection of Nazareth as a place of abode so readily as by supposing that he was previously connected with it? Cf. Just. M. *Dial.* § 78, p. 303 D.

As for the ἀπογραφή, it is enough to say with Wetstein: "Epocha tam celebris non potuit Lucam latere." Cf. Acts v. 37 (1851). I leave this note as it was written eight years since. No one now after Zumpt's Essay (Berlin, 1854) can doubt that Quirinus was governor of Syria at the time of our Lord's birth as well as ten years afterwards.

another, that each picture is drawn with perfect independence, and yet so that the separate details are exactly capable of harmonious adjustment. There is nothing in the one which could lead to the creation of the other; their boundary lines just meet where the character of the scene changes, and they must be united with care that their real continuity may be discovered. Yet if we regard the precise words of the Evangelists, without introducing glosses of our own, their harmony is complete. And if we penetrate to the ideas which they present to us as fulfilled, these are seen to have a permanent importance for the right conception of the history. For both narratives point yet higher in word and idea than the special limits to which they naturally tend, and unite in the spiritual teaching of St. John: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God, ... and the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us."

II. The Baptism.

Justin represents Trypho as saying that "the Messiah would be unconscious of His own office and unendowed with power, till He had been consecrated by Elias."[1] The narrative of the Baptism in St. Matthew points out the element of truth which was contained in this belief. The work of the Baptist included the crowning rite of the old covenant, the confession of a spiritual need under an outward shape. Repentance,—the complete change of mind which was the fitting preparation for the kingdom of heaven, was consecrated in a sacramental sign, and the last ordinance of Judaism was in essence and form a prophecy of Christianity. The new Elias recognized his personal unworthiness to baptize Jesus "unto repentance,"[2]

St. Matthew.

1 *Dial. c. Tryph.* § 8, p. 226 B: Χριστὸς δέ εἰ καὶ γεγένηται καὶ ἔστι που, ἄγνωστός ἐστι καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτός πω ἑαυτὸν ἐπίσταται οὐδὲ ἔχει δύναμίν τινα μέχρις ἂν ἐλθὼν Ἠλίας χρίσῃ αὐτὸν καὶ φανερὸν πᾶσι ποιήσῃ.

2 Yet even in this there is no difficulty to those who have learnt from St. Paul the cardinal doctrine of the Redemption (2 Cor. v. 21), and see in our Lord the "ideal" man, in the noblest sense of ancient philosophy, the "last Adam" in the language of revelation. In proportion as this truth is forgot-

and yet he knew not that He was the Messiah till the promised sign appeared.[1] Simple faith in his mission shut out all conjecture and suspended, it may have been, all hope. But the very act which he would have hindered brought with it the token for which he was waiting. It was fitting,[2] alike for him as the faithful prophet of the Advent, and for Christ, as "subject to the Law," to fulfil every rite sanctioned by God,—the perfect righteousness of the Jewish covenant. And thus at this point of their contact, the form of the New was shaped by the rules of the Old; and the gift of the Spirit for Christ's work on earth was connected with a legal observance.

St. Luke.

St. Luke, on the other hand, does not dwell on this relation. On the contrary, he connects the Baptism of our Lord with that of "the multitude" generally, instead of isolating it as a fact wholly alone.[3] He regards the event as it affected the Saviour among others, and not apart from them. In this aspect he records His prayer when the heavens were opened rather than the concession by which the act was prefaced.[4] From a like reason he gives the heavenly voice as it was addressed to Christ: "*Thou* art my beloved Son; in *Thee* I am well pleased;" and not as addressed to John or the people at large: "*This* is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased," as the words are preserved in St. Matthew. Nor is there any discrepancy in this various transcription of the one divine testimony.[5] Here, as elsewhere, the spiritual mes-

ten, the fact itself became an offence. Thus in "the Gospel according to the Hebrews" the following passage occurred: "Ecce mater Domini et fratres ejus dicebant ei: Joannes Baptista baptizat in remissionem peccatorum: eamus et baptizemur ab eo. Dixit autem eis: Quid peccavi, ut vadam et baptizer ab eo? Nisi forte hoc ipsum quod dixi ignorantia est" (Hieron. *adv. Pelag.* iii. 2, p. 782).

1 John i. 33. Cf. p. 314 n. 1.

2 Matt. iii. 15: ἄφες ἄρτι· οὕτως γὰρ πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην. Πρέπειν occurs here only in the Gospels: there is a contrast with ἐγὼ Χρείαν ἔχω in v. 14.

3 Luke iii. 21: ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τὸν λαόν, καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος καὶ προσευχομένου, ἀνεῳχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανόν.

4 The same peculiarity occurs in St. Luke's account of the Transfiguration: ix. 29, (18). Cf. v. 16; vi. 12; xi. 1; (xxii. 41).

5 Augustine (*de cons. Ev.* i. 2, § 14)

sage becomes articulate only to the individual soul;[1] the material sign is intelligible only by divine revelation.[2]

The Temptation necessarily followed the Baptism.[3]

III. The Temptation.

Luke iv. 1.

Mark i. 13.

The first act of the public ministry of the Lord was to reverse the outward circumstances of the fall. In the *fulness of the Spirit* He passed into the wilderness to regain the Paradise which Adam lost;[4] *He was with the wild beasts*, in the graphic words of St. Mark, who compresses into this one pregnant sentence the central lesson of the trial, and adds no further details of its course. The two other Evangelists record the same events with an important variation in order, and some slight verbal differences. The representative points of the temptation, for the narratives imply much which they do not contain,[5] are given in each case in the order which

says well: "Diversitas locutionum adhuc etiam utilis est, ne uno modo dictum minus intelligatur." . . . In the account of the Transfiguration — the outward manifestation of Christ's glory — all the Evangelists have οὗτος ἐστίν.

1 It is, however, important to maintain the objective reality of the voice and sign, though faith was necessary in order to obtain their true meaning. Cf. John xii. 28–30. Acts ix. 7 (ἀκούοντες τῆς φωνῆς); xxii. 9 (οὐκ ἤκουσαν τὴν φωνήν; Dan. x. 7). Cf. *Characteristics of Gospel Miracles*, pp. 120 ff.

2 Cf. Hieron, *ad Matt.* iii. 16, "Aperiuntur autem cœli non reseratione elementorum sed spiritualibus oculis."

On the traditional variations as to the details of the Baptism, see Just. M. *Dial.* § 88, pp. 315 D; 316 D, and Otto's notes; Anger, *Synopsis Evv.* § 15.

In St. Mark's account of the Baptism the present participles are characteristic: ἀναβαίνων, σχιζομένους, καταβαίνων. He alone adds ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ (i. 9), while the other Evangelists mention our Lord's residence there (Matt. ii. 23; Luke ii. 51).

3 It is instructive to compare the different phrases by which the Temptation is introduced:

Matt iv. 1: ἀνήχθη . . . . ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος πειρασθῆναι (conducting)

Mark i. 12: τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτὸν ἐκβάλλει (constraining).

Luke iv. 1: Ἰησοῦς δὲ πλήρης Πνεύματος ἁγίου . . . ἤγετο ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι (inspiring).

It has been noticed already that the Temptation precedes the narrative in John i. 19.

4 Bengel, *ad Marc.* l. c.: "Res magna. Gen. i. 26 . . . Imperium in bestias, cujus Adamus tam mature jacturam fecerat, in summa jam exinanitione exercuit: quanto magis exaltatus: Ps. viii. 8." The forms of the Temptation have been often compared with the temptations of Adam: *e. g.* Hilar. *ad Matt.* iii. 5.

5 E. g. Luke iv. 1, 2: ἤγετο εἰς τὴν ἔρημον ἡμέρας τεσσεράκοντα πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου. Cf. *Hom. Clem.* xi. 35, ὁ ἀποστείλας ἡμᾶς Κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ Προφήτης ὑφηγήσατο ἡμῖν ὡς ὁ πονηρὸς τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέ-

preserves a climax from the particular position occupied by the writer. Taking the arrangement of St. Matthew, we see our Lord triumphing over the natural wants of humanity; refusing to tempt the sustaining power of Providence; and finally shrinking from a momentary alliance with the powers of darkness, even to establish the temporal Messianic sway, when He saw *the glory of the kingdoms of the world.* The first temptation occupies the same position in St. Luke. Personal and material cravings are from any side the first and simplest form of temptation; but the order of the two latter temptations is reversed. The preservation of the just relation of the Saviour to God occupies in St. Luke the final place which St. Matthew assigns to the vindication of Messiah's independence of the world. In St. Luke the idea of a temporal empire of Christ passes more clearly into that of mere earthly dominion, which is distinctly regarded as in the power and gift of Satan.[1] The crowning struggle of Christ is not to repress the solicitation to antedate the outward victory of His power, but to maintain His human dependence upon His Father's will. Before Messiah the king the temptations arise in the order of His relations to sense, to God, to man; before the *man Christ Jesus*, in his relations to sense, to man, to God. The sequence is one of idea and not of time. The incidents are given wholly without any temporal connection in St. Luke, and the language of St. Matthew is more definite only in appearance.[2] The narrative, indeed, is one which may perhaps help to show the impossibility of applying to things spiritual and eternal that "phantom of succession," in the shadow of which we are commonly forced to speak and act. However this may be, the closing words of the two narratives corres-

Matt. iv. 8.

1 *Tim. ii.* 5.

ρας διαλεχθεὶς αὐτῷ. . . . . Cf. *Hom.* xix. 2.

1 Luke iv. 6: ἐμοὶ παραδέδοται, καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν θέλω δίδωμι αὐτήν.

2 Luke iv. 3, καὶ εἶπεν . . . 5, καὶ ἀναγαγών . . . 9, καὶ ἤγαγεν . . . Matt. iv. 3, καὶ προσελθών . . . 5, τότε παραλαμβάνει . . . 8, πάλιν παραλαμβάνει . . .

pond to what appear to be their fundamental notions. St. Matthew records the ministry of angels to a heavenly Prince;[1] St. Luke shades the brightness of the present triumph with a dim foreboding of the coming sufferings of the Saviour: *then the Devil departed from Him* — but only — *for a season*.[2]

IV. The Transfiguration.

The importance which the Jews attached to the consecration of the Messiah by Elias has been already noticed; and tradition was much occupied with the various other functions which the great prophet should discharge in the preparation of the heavenly kingdom.[3] But Elias, the representative of the second stage in the Jewish dispensation, was not alone, though he occupied the most prominent place in the popular anticipations of a glorious future. The Mosaic type of the Messiah was not lost, though it had fallen into the back-ground; and there were some who argued that as the ancient lawgiver had reflected the divine glory from his countenance, so it should be with the prophet like to him whom the Lord should raise up in after time, for Moses was both a minister and an image of the Messiah. The expectation thus formed received a literal and yet a spiritual fulfilment. The partial and borrowed glory with which Moses had shone became a complete transfiguration in the case of Christ. That was from without; this from within. That was a sign to all the people; this only to the chosen three, to the zealous, the reverent and the loving. What in old times was given as a token of visible splendor was now changed into a source of silent faith.[4] But even under these changed relations, the correspondence of the two events "upon the mount" is very striking. It is im-

Deut. xviii. 18.

1 Matt. iv. 11, καὶ ἰδού, ἄγγελοι προσῆλθον καὶ διηκόνουν αὐτῷ, compared with Mark i. 13, ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι διηκόνουν αὐτῷ. Cf. Luke xxii. 43.

2 Luke iv. 13, ἀπέστη ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἄχρι καιροῦ. Cf. John xiv. 30.

3 Cf. Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr. in Matt.* xvii. 10 (ii. p. 339).

4 Contrast Matt. xvii. 9 with Ex. xxxiv. 29 ff.

possible to read St. Matthew's account of the Transfiguration without recurring to the scene in the Exodus when the face of Moses shone, and the children of Israel *were afraid to come nigh to him;* and the peculiar language which he uses coincides exactly with the form of Jewish tradition.[1] He alone records the prostration of the disciples through their excessive fear, and the Master's strengthening touch and cheering words, uttered once before upon the stormy lake.[2] It is with equal significance that St. Matthew — the Hebrew Evangelist — relates, without the implied reproof which is added by St. Mark and St. Luke,[3] the wish of St. Peter to erect *three tabernacles, one for Christ, and one for Moses, and one for Elias,* — to give, as it were, a permanent standing place to the Jewish law and its prophetic development in connection with the Gospel,— when in truth they were just departing.[4] St. Luke, on the other hand, again at this new crisis recalls to notice the perfect manhood of the Saviour. He who was praying when He was specially marked out for His public ministry, prays also at His installation to the mediatorial office.[5] The characteristic difference between St. Luke and the other Evangelists is yet more clearly brought out by the more considerable peculiarities of their narratives. St. Matthew and St. Mark place in immediate connec-

Exod. xxxiv. 29, 30.

Matt. xvii. 9—13; *Mark ix.* 9—13.

1 Matt. xvii. 2, καὶ ἔλαμψε τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος (cf. xiii. 43). "Fulgida facta fuit facies Mosis instar solis" (Wetst. *ad loc.*). The feature common to all the Evangelists, "His raiment became white," is singularly illustrated by *Bereshith R.* (Wetst. *l. c.*): "Vestes lucis, hæ vestes Adami primi." Cf. Apoc. vii. 13 ff. The material imagery of St. Mark is worthy of notice, λευκὰ ὡς χιών, οἷα γναφεὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται λευκᾶναι (Mark ix. 3), compared with λευκὰ ὡς τὸ φῶς (Matt. xvii. 2) and λευκὸς ἐξαστράπτων (Luke ix. 29).

2 Matt. xvii. 6, 7, μὴ φοβεῖσθε. Cf. Matt. xiv. 27; xxviii. 10.

3 Mark ix. 6, οὐ γὰρ ἤδει τί λαλήσῃ. Luke ix. 33, μὴ εἰδὼς ὃ λέγει.

4 Luke ix. 33, ἐν τῷ διαχωρίζεσθαι. It may be remarked that the heavenly voice follows on the departure of Moses and Elias. When they passed away came the words, common to all the Evangelists, "This is my beloved Son . . . Hear Him."

5 Luke ix. 29, ἐν τῷ προσεύχεσθαι.

tion with the Transfiguration[1] a remarkable conversation about Elias, which serves to point out the spiritual connection of the new and old. The substance is the same in both; but St. Mark expresses with greater distinctness the contrast between the traditional idea of Elias's coming, and its real effects upon Messiah's kingdom;[2] Elias had indeed come and restored all things, but for the advent of a suffering Redeemer, and not for the conquest of a mighty prince. St. Luke omits this discourse, but he gives the subject of that more mysterious conversation when Moses and Elias "talked"[3] with the Lord. The addition is one of the greatest interest, for it connects the recital of Christ's sufferings with the fullest manifestation of His glory. The Passion, with its triumphant issue, was the point to which the Law and the prophets tended, and thus we read that the representatives of both *talked* to Christ *of the* Exodus *which He was about to fulfil in Jerusalem.*[4] The Apostles themselves were as yet unprepared for the tidings. As at Gethsemane they *were heavy with sleep, but at last when they were awake they saw Christ's glory, and the two men that stood with Him.*

While there are these significant variations[5] in the details of the narrative itself, all the Evangelists relate the same previous conversation and the same subsequent miracle. The prediction of the disciples' trials, the image

1 The question τί οὖν, κ. τ. λ., Matt. xvii. 10 (cf. Mark ix. 11) seems to refer to v. 9, so that the sense is: If this visit of Elias must not be proclaimed till Thou comest in Thy power, can we still believe that he *shall*, according to the teaching of the scribes, prepare Thy way?

2 Mark ix. 12. Olshausen, rightly, I think, considers this to be the purport of the verse. Καὶ πῶς introduces an objection grounded on the resumption of the former clause (If it be so, how then . . .), which is resolved by Ἀλλά (Nay, doubt not; I tell you . . .).

3 Matt. xvii. 3; Mark ix. 4 (συλλαλοῦντες).

4 Luke ix. 31, 32, ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ ἣν ἔμελλε πληροῦν ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ. The construction of λέγειν is unusual, but occurs again Rom. iv. 6, and in the earliest classical writers in the sense of "recounting," "relating the details of," "describing." The word ἔξοδος itself is less definite than decease, and may be best illustrated by the technical sense (Arist. *Poet.* xii.) "The closing scene of a Tragedy."

5 The additions in Mark ix. 10, Matt. xvii. 5 (ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα) are characteristic.

of their Lord's triumph, and, flowing from it, the certainty of the disciples' help, exhibit a glorious sequence from every point of view, which few will attribute to an apt coincidence or to a conscious design.

V. The Passion.

It does not form any part of our plan to examine at length the synoptic histories of the Passion, or to compare them in detail with that of St. John.[1] It will be enough for the present to notice the chief peculiarities of the different Evangelists, so that it may be seen how far they explain the aim and office of each, without regarding the whole progress or the minute relations of the different narratives. Both historically and doctrinally the Passion appears as the central and crowning point of the Gospel. Where all else is described in rapid outlines this is recorded with solemn particularity, and the characteristic traits in each account are proportionately more numerous and salient than elsewhere. Without asserting that these furnish a complete solution of the difficulties by which they are accompanied, they contribute at least an important element towards the investigation of them. They place us, in some measure, in the position from which the several Evangelists regarded the course of the whole scene, and charge the picture with the varied forms of busy and restless action, which the great master of Venice has dared to portray with vivid and startling reality.[2]

ST. MATTHEW.

Cf. Luke xxiv. 21.

The peculiarities in St. Matthew's narrative are numerous and uniform in character. With more or less distinctness they all tend to show how the Messiahship of Jesus was attested during the course of events which checked the faith of some; and the same feeling which directed the

1 The chronology of the Passion Week — a subject which cannot be left unnoticed — is examined in a note at the end of the chapter.

2 The first effect of Tintoretto's great "Crucifixion" is perhaps offensive from the fulness of life which it exhibits, yet on deeper study we feel that the Passion must have been witnessed in some such form.

selection of the points of the narrative, influenced the manner of their treatment. In the form, as well as in many of the details, there is something of an Old Testament complexion which completes the impression produced by the circumstances themselves. These are, indeed, in some cases singularly significant. In St. Matthew alone we read the last testimonies which were given to the Messiahship of the Lord by Himself and by His enemies. Nowhere else is there the same open and unreserved declaration of the Saviour's majesty as in St. Matthew's description of the Betrayal and the Judgment. The crises of apparent hopelessness are exactly those which call forth the most royal declarations of sovereign power. When the disciples would have defended their Master at Gethsemane, He reminds them that He could bring to His aid legions of angels, but that the Scriptures must needs be fulfilled; that His kingdom is not to be supported or destroyed by the sword; that He must finish His work on earth before He comes in the clouds of heaven.[1] So again, when He stands before the great tribunal of the chosen nation, in answer to the solemn adjuration of the High Priest,[2] He claims the name and the glory of the Christ. Up to that moment He was silent, but then at last the recognition of the sacred power of the minister of God brought with it the words which proved to be the final condemnation of Judaism. Then it was that as *Christ* He was mocked by the people;[3] and, meanwhile, the remorse and death of Judas witnessed in another place to the fulfilment of Messianic types in the Psalms and Prophets.[4] So far Christ is seen to be openly proclaimed

1 Matt. xxvi. 52—54. Cf. John xviii. 7.

2 Matt. xxvi. 63, 64, ἐξορκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος ἵνα ἡμῖν εἴπῃς . . . This clause is peculiar to St. Matthew.

3 Matt. xxvi. 68, Προφήτευσον ἡμῖν, Χριστέ, τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε; the word Χριστέ is wanting in the other Gospels. Compare also xxvii. 17 with Mark xv. 9.

4 Matt. xxvii. 3—10. The fulfilment of prophecy in the history of the Passion is specially noticed by St. Matthew (xxvi. 56, τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν . . . compared with Mc. xiv. 49), some-

and rejected by His people; but He is also regarded under a peculiar relation to Gentiles. The dream of Pilate's wife, and the symbolic purification[1] of the governor himself, express the influence which the righteousness[2] of the Saviour exercised upon their imagination and judgment. The one carries us back to the early history of the Jews, when the fortunes of the nation were fashioned by the dreams of heathen princes,— of Abimelech, of Pharaoh, of Nebuchadnezzar;[3] the other points forward to the terrible consummation of the curse now uttered in reckless unbelief.[4] One other testimony remains; St. Matthew alone tells us that *the earth was shaken and the rocks rent, and many bodies of the saints which slept arose*,[5] at the death of Christ, whose power was felt in the depths of Nature and of Hades when men asked in mockery for the confirmation of His words: *He said, I am the Son of God.* Matt. xxvii. 43.

ST. MARK.

The details peculiar to St. Mark are less numerous, but hardly less characteristic. It has been remarked often that the account of the *young man who fled naked* proves that we have in the second Gospel the narrative of an eye-witness, who was nearly

times directly as here and xxvi. 31 ‖ Mc. xiv. 27 (Zech. xiii. 7), and sometimes indirectly, xxvii. 34 (Ps. lxviii. 21), 43 (Ps. xxi. 9). The contrast between Matt. xxvi. 24 ‖ Mc. xiv. 21 (ὡς γέγραπται) and Lc. xxii. 22 (κατὰ τὸ ὡρισμένον) is full of meaning. The quotation in xxvii. 35 is certainly an interpolation.

1 Cf. Deut. xxi. 6, 7.

2 Matt. xxvii. 19, Μηδὲν σοὶ καὶ τῷ δικαίῳ ἐκείνῳ ... xxvii. 24, Ἀθῷός εἰμι ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τούτου [τοῦ δικαίου]; but the last words are probably an interpolation.

3 Gen. xx. 3; xli. 25; Dan. ii. 3.

4 Matt. xxvii. 25, τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ἡμῶν.

5 Hilar. *ad* Matt. xxvii. 51, 52: "*Movetur terra:* capax enim hujus mortui esse non poterat. *Petræ scissæ sunt:* omnia enim tum valida et fortia penetrans Dei Verbum et potestas æternæ virtutis irruperat. *Et monumenta aperta sunt:* erant enim mortis claustra reserata. *Et multa corpora sanctorum dormientum surrexerunt:* illuminans enim mortis tenebras et infernorum obscura collustrans, in Sanctorum ad præsens conspicatorum resurrectione mortis ipsius spolia detrahebat." The use of the phrase οἱ ἅγιοι is remarkable, which does not occur elsewhere absolutely in the New Testament, except of Christians, and not at all in the Gospels: Acts ix. 13, 32, 41; xxvi. 10; Rom. xii. 13, etc.; Apoc. xi. 18; xviii. 20. And yet more, the form of expression, πολλὰ σώματα τῶν ἁγίων ... ἠγέρθησαν, cannot be overlooked in the interpretation of the passage.

concerned in an incident which would have seemed trivial to others.[1] One or two other minute points lead to the same conclusion. In the account of the testimony of "the false witnesses," St. Mark appears to have preserved words of the Lord which do not occur in the other Evangelists;[2] and he alone notices the disagreement of their testimony.[3] In the same way he characterizes Simon the Cyrenian as *the father of Alexander and Rufus*,[4] and in him alone we read that Pilate investigated the reality of the death of Christ.[5]

St. Luke.

The special details by which the narrative of St. Luke is distinguished are more obviously marked by a common character, and seem in some measure as a complement to those of St. Matthew. For while the peculiar traits preserved by St. Matthew exhibit in various aspects the Messianic dignity of the Lord, those preserved by St. Luke seem rather to present notices of

1 Mark xiv. 51, 52. Cf. p. 237, *n.* 1.

2 Mark xiv. 58, τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον τὸν χειροποίητον . . . ἄλλον ἀχειροποίητον. The words do not occur elsewhere in the Gospels; but compare Hebr. ix. 11, 24; 2 Cor. v. 1.

3 Mark xiv. οὐδὲ οὕτως ἴση ἦν ἡ μαρτυρία αὐτῶν. We have in the testimony of the witnesses a point of contact with the Gospel of St. John. The difference between the recorded words of our Lord and the report of the witnesses is striking: *I can destroy* (Matt. xxvi. 61, δύναμαι καταλῦσαι); *I will destroy* (Mark xiv. 58, καταλύσω), as compared with *Destroy . . . and I will raise* (John ii. 19, λύσατε . . . καὶ ἐγερῶ).

4 Mark xv. 21.

5 Mark xv. 44, 45. The quotation in xv. 28 is certainly an interpolation.

The details common to St. Matthew and St. Mark which are not found in St. Luke are numerous:

Matt. xxvi. 31, 32.		Mark xiv. 27, 28.		The future foretold.
—	— 37, 38.	—	— 33, 34.	The selection of Peter, James, and John.
—	— 40—45.	—	— 37—41.	The *three* warnings.
—	— 48.	—	— 44.	The sign of the kiss.
—	— 59—66.	—	— 55—64.	The false witness.
—	xxvii. 12—14.	—	xv. 4, 5.	The Lord's silence before Pilate. Cf. John xix. 9.
—	— 26.	—	— 15.	The scourging. Cf. John xix. 1.
—	— 27—31.	—	— 16—20.	The mockery of the soldiers with the reed (Matt.) and crown.
—	— 34.	—	— 23.	The deadening draught.
—	— 39, 40.	—	— 29, 30.	The mockery of the passers-by. Cf. Luke xxiii. 35.
—	— 46—49.	—	— 34—36.	The cry of agony.

human sympathy, points of contact with common life, evidences of a perfect manhood. This is more evident if account is taken of the details common to the two other Evangelists which St. Luke omits; and, though it may appear fanciful to insist on every difference as an example of a difference of scope (chiefly through the faults in our apprehension and representation of them), yet the total effect of contrast and combined effect cannot be doubted. St. Luke alone has preserved the question which showed the devotion of the disciples to their Lord, when the boldness of one raised the sword in His defence:[1] he alone records the thrice repeated declaration of Pilate, that "he found no fault in Him;"[2] and notices the accusation for civil crimes,[3] and the examination before Herod.[4] In him we read of the angel which "strengthened" the Lord's human nature at the Agony;[5] of "an hour of His enemies and of the power of darkness," when their malice could find full scope;[6] of that look which recalled to St. Peter the greatness of his fall;[7] of the words in which He resigned His Spirit to His Father.[8] The last word of mercy, in which He removed the injury which had been wrought by mistaken zeal;[9] the last word of warning, in which He turned the thoughts of mourners to the personal consequences of the deed which moved their compassion;[10] the

1 Luke xxii. 49, Ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν τὸ ἐσόμενον εἶπαν Κύριε, εἰ πατάξομεν ἐν μαχαίρᾳ. The words seem to exclude any idea but that of sacrifice in a desperate cause.

2 Luke xxiii. 4, 14, 22.

3 Luke xxiii. 2, ... διαστρέφοντα τὸ ἔθνος ἡμῶν καὶ κωλύοντα φόρους Καίσαρι διδόναι . . .

4 Ambros. ad Luc. xxiii. 4—12. "In typo etiam Herodis atque Pilati, qui amici ex inimicis facti sunt per Jesum Christum, plebis Israel populique gentilis figura, quod per Domini passionem utriusque sit futura concordia" . . .

5 Luke xxii. 43, 44. The extent and character of the variations in the evidence as to the authenticity of this passage point (like similar variations in other parts of the Gospel) to a double recension of the Gospel, proceeding, as it appears, from the Evangelist himself.

6 Luke xxii. 53, αὕτη ὑμῶν ἐστὶν ἡ ὥρα καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους. Cf. iv. 13, ὁ διάβολος ἀπέστη ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἄχρι καιροῦ.

7 Luke xxii. 61, καὶ στραφεὶς ὁ Κύριος ἐνέβλεψεν τῷ Πέτρῳ. . . .

8 Luke xxiii. 46, Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου. The echo of the words still lingers in the phrase of St. Peter: 1 Pet. iv. 19.

9 Luke xxii. 51.

10 Luke xxiii. 27—31.

last prayer of infinite love, in which He pleaded for those who reviled and slew Him;[1] the last act of sovereign grace in which He spoke a blessing from the cross;[2] are all recorded alone by the companion of St. Paul. In St. Matthew we saw that the dead did homage to the crucified Messiah: in St. Luke[3] *all the multitudes that came together, and saw the things which were done, returned, beating their breasts for sorrow.*[4]

1 Luke xxiii. 34. Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἴδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν. These words reappear in the narrative of the martyrdom of James, "the brother of the Lord," preserved by Eusebius, *H. E.* ii 23, Παρακαλῶ Κύριε, Θεέ, Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἴδασι τί ποιοῦσιν.

2 Luke xxiii. 43.

3 Luke xxiii. 48.

4 It may not be out of place to notice one apparent discrepancy in the accounts of the Passion on which the opponents of the literal accuracy of the Evangelists insist with the greatest confidence. It is said that each of the four Evangelists gives the inscription on the cross in different words. The statement is certainly so far true that each Evangelist gives a phrase which is not entirely coincident with that given by any one of the others, but a close examination of the narratives furnishes no sufficient reason for supposing that all proposed to give the same or the entire inscription. St. John, indeed, uses such terms as to leave no doubt as to his record: ἔγραφεν δὲ καὶ τίτλον ὁ Πιλᾶτος . . . ἦν δὲ γεγραμμένον . . . Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων (John xix. 19). These *Greek* words then we may be assured were certainly placed upon the cross; but if we compare the language of St. John with that of St. Mark, it will be obvious that St. Mark only designs to give *the words which contained the point of the accusation*,—the alleged usurpation of royal dignity,—καὶ ἦν ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ τῆς αἰτίας αὐτοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένη. Ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων (Mark xv. 26); and these words which contain the charge are common to all the Evangelists. The language of St. Matthew and St. Luke again, though this might be disputed, seems to imply that they have preserved respectively the two remaining forms of the trilingual inscription: ἐπέθηκαν . . . . τὴν αἰτίαν αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένην· Οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων (Matt. xxvii. 37)—ἦν δὲ καὶ ἐπιγραφὴ ἐπ' αὐτῷ· Ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὗτος (Luke xxiii. 38). If this natural conjecture be admitted, the difference is a proof of completeness, and not of discrepancy. St. Matthew would certainly preserve the Hebrew form in his original Gospel; and the title in St. Luke as given in *Cod. Corb.*, "Rex Judæorum hic est," seems like the scornful turn of the Latin title. However this may be, there is at least no possibility of showing any inconsistency on the strictly literal interpretation of the words of the Evangelist.

The difference between John xix. 14 (ἕκτη) and Mark xv. 25 (τρίτη. Cf. xv. 33; Matt. xxvii. 45; Luke xxiii. 44) seems clearly to point to a different mode of reckoning (Cf. John xviii. 28. Ewald, *Christus*, 217). Again, no one would find a contradiction in the following sentence: βαστάζων τὸν σταυρὸν ἐξῆλθεν . . . ἐξερχόμενοι δὲ εὗρον Σίμωνα· τοῦτον ἠγγάρευσαν ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν σταυρόν (John xix. 17; Matt. xxvii. 32).

VI. The Resurrection.

The various narratives of the Resurrection place the fragmentariness of the Gospel in the clearest light. They contain difficulties which it is impossible to explain with certainty, but there is no less an intelligible fitness and purpose in the details peculiar to each account. The existence of difficulties in brief records of such a crisis is no more than a natural consequence of its character. The events of the first great Easter morning were evidently so rapid in their sequence and so startling in their lessons, that a complete history would have been impossible.[1] Even in ordinary circumstances the effects produced by the same outward phenomena, and the impressions which they convey to different persons in moments of great excitement, are so various, that we are in some measure prepared for apparent discrepancies in the recital of the facts which accompanied what was the new birth of believers no less than of the Saviour. At the same time, we know so little of the laws of the spiritual world, and of the conditions under which beings of another order are revealed to men, that it is idle to urge as a final inconsistency the diversity of visions which, while truly objective, may still have depended, in a manner which may be faintly conceived, on the character of the witnesses to whom they were given. And besides all this, there are so many tokens of unrecorded facts in the brief summaries which are preserved, that no argument can be based upon apparent discrepancies sufficient to prove the existence of absolute error.[2] Where the evi-

1 In this sense the closing words of St. John's Gospel, which are passed over too often as a mere hyperbole, contain a truth, which, as it holds in a lower sense of the details of every human life, is absolutely true of the details of the Perfect Life — *ἅτινα ἐὰν γράφηται καθ' ἕν, οὐδὲ αὐτὸν οἶμαι τὸν κόσμον χωρῆσαι τὰ γραφόμενα βιβλία.* This perception of the infinity of life makes the historian a true poet.

2 For instance, from John xx. 7, it appears that Mary Magdalene did *not* enter the sepulchre at the first visit; and this fact gives a clew to the explanation of the Angelic Visions. In Matt. xxviii. 16 (*οὗ ἐτάξατο αὐτοῖς*) there is a reference to other revelations of the Lord to the Apostles than that which the Evangelist has recorded. St. Luke (xxiv. 34) notices incidentally an appearance to St. Peter which he has not

dence is confessedly imperfect, it may be wise to hesitate, but it is presumptuous to condemn; and the possibility of reconciliation in the case of partial and independent narratives is all that the student of the Gospels requires. When it is seen that this possibility is further combined with the existence of a special character in the separate accounts, the whole question will be presented in a truer and more instructive form. We shall learn to acquiesce in the existence of diversities which we cannot finally solve, when we find enough recorded to satisfy the individual designs of the Evangelists and the permanent needs of Christians.

The true aspect of the narratives.

It is necessary to repeat these obvious remarks, because the records of the Resurrection have given occasion to some of the worst examples of that kind of criticism from which the other parts of the Gospels have suffered, though not in an equal degree. It is tacitly assumed that we are in possession of all the circumstances of the event, and thus, on the one hand, differences are urged as fatal, and on the other, elaborate attempts are made to show that the details given can be forced into the semblance of a complete and connected narrative. The true critic will pause before he admits either extreme. He will not expect to find in each Gospel, nor yet in the combination of them, a full and circumstantial record of a mere fact of common history; and he will be equally little inclined to bind down the possible solutions of the difficulties introduced by variations and omissions to one definite form. He will rather acknowledge the characteristics of the truth in narratives incom-

detailed; and the same appearance seems to be referred to by St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 5). St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 6) helps us to distinguish the appearance to the gathered church in Galilee from the last appearance to the Apostles (Luke xxiv. 44 ff.), with which it has been confounded; and notices an appearance to James, which is elsewhere only recorded in apocryphal traditions. If any further testimony to the multiplicity and variety of the revelations of the Risen Lord is required, it is given in the widest terms by St. Luke in Acts i 3 (ἐν πολλοῖς τεκμηρίοις, ὀπτανόμενος).

plete as historical relations, and yet most perfect as lessons of divine truth embodied in representative facts.

Regarding the recorded details of the Resurrection from this point of view, we can dismiss without any minute inquiry the various schemes which have been proposed for bringing them, as they stand at present, into one connected narrative. Whether the harmonist has recourse to a multiplication of similiar incidents, or, with a truer insight into the style of the Scriptures, sees in the several accounts perspective views, as it were, in which several incidents are naturally grouped together,[1] we may accept the general conclusion without insisting on the several steps by which it is reached. That will rather be an object of study, to regard each separate account as conveying a distinct image of the signs and results of Christ's victory. The fullest and truest view of the whole will then naturally follow. The most general will result from the most particular; the final impression, from a combination of wholes and not from a mosaic of fragments.

As distinct wholes, and not fragments capable of separate combination.

The narrative of St. Matthew is, as is commonly the case, the least minute. The great features of the history are traced with bold outline. Faith and unbelief, fear and joy, are seen together in the closest contrast; and over all is the light of a glorious majesty abiding "even unto the end." Heaven and earth are combined in one wide view;[2] Messiah reigns, and the opposition of His enemies is powerless. The visit of the women, the angelic ministry, a source of deadly terror to the guards, of "great joy" to the believing, the appearance of the Lord, the falsehood of the watch, the division among the disciples, the last charge, combine to form a noble picture, yet so as to convey no impression of a complete narrative. But the peculiar traits in this brief sum-

ST. MATTHEW.

1 This form of explanation is well followed out by Ebrard (*Krit. d. Evang. Gesch.*), though with his usual errors in taste.

2 Matt. xxviii. 18.

mary are both numerous and important. St. Matthew alone notices the outward glory of the Resurrection, the earthquake, the sensible ministry of the divine messenger, the watch of enemies replaced by the guarding angel. The vigilance of Roman soldiery and the authority of priestly power are seen to be unable to check the might of the new faith.[1] The majesty of the triumphant Messiah is shown again by a fact which St. Matthew has preserved as to the feelings of His disciples. He alone notices the humble adoration of the risen Lord before His Ascension,[2] and, as if with jealous care, traces to its origin the calumny "currently reported" among the Jews "to this day." St. Mark mentions the command to the disciples to go to Galilee, but St. Matthew alone relates the final charge to the assembly of believers, which was given in solemn majesty, and it may be on the very mountain on which Christ first taught them.[3] Thus it was foreshown that Jerusalem was no longer to remain the Holy City, the final centre of the Church. The "scattered flock" were again gathered together by their Master in the despised country from which they had first followed Him.[4] The world-wide extent of His kingdom is at once proclaimed. Their commission extended "to all the nations;" and the highest mystery of the faith is conveyed in the words which are the passport into the Christian community.

Matt. xxviii. 11 *ff.*

Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

The narrative of St. Mark is attended by peculiar difficulties. The original text, from whatever cause it may have happened, terminated abruptly after the account of the angelic vision.[5] The his-

ST. MARK.

1 Lange, *Leben Jesu.*

2 Matt. xxviii. 9, 17. Contrast Mark xv. 19. In Luke xxiv. 52 the words *προσκυνήσαντες αὐτὸν* are very doubtful.

3 Matt. xxviii. 16, *τὸ ὄρος οὗ ἐτάξατο αὐτοῖς.*

4 Matt. xxvi. 31, 32 (*προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν*).

5 Mark xvi. 8, *ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ.* It is vain to speculate on the causes of this abrupt close. The evidence in favor of the remaining verses seems to establish their canonicity, though they cannot be regarded as part of the original narrative of St. Mark. There is no inconsistency between Mark xvi. 13 and Luke xxiv. 34, 35, but rather a

tory of the revelations of the Lord Himself was added at another time and probably by another hand. Yet in both parts of the record one common feature may be noticed, which seems to present the peculiar characteristic of the Gospel. The disciples hesitate before they accept the fact which surpassed their hope. There is doubt before there is faith. Thus, as St. Mark preserves an especial assurance of the reality of Christ's death, so he confirms most strongly the reality of His resurrection. His narrative shows that the witnesses were not mere enthusiasts who believed what they wished to be true. The women "told nothing to any man" when they had first seen the angelic vision. The apostles only yielded finally to the reproof of their Master when they had rejected in their bitter mourning the testimony of those to whom He had appeared. This gradual progress to faith exhibits that outward side of the history which is further illustrated by the details which the Evangelist has preserved from the Lord's last charge. The promises of miraculous power assume in this a speciality and distinctness to which there is elsewhere no parallel; and the brief clause in which the progress of the Church and the working of its ministers is described, leads the reader to see on earth the present power of that mighty Saviour, who in this Gospel only is described as "seated on the right hand of God."[1]

Mark xvi. 8.

Mark xvi. 1.

Mark xvi. 17, 18.

St. Luke presents many of the same details as St. Mark, but at a greater length and apparently with a different object. He does not dwell directly on the majesty of the Resurrection, as St. Matthew, nor on the simple fact of it, as St. Mark, but rather connects it with the Passion, and unfolds the spiritual necessity by which suffering and victory were united.

St. Luke.

most true trait of nature: cf. Luke xxiv. 37. Nor is there any connection of time in xvi. 15, καὶ εἶπεν, κ. τ. λ.

[1] Mark xvi. 19. Cf. Matt. xxvi. 64; Luke xxii. 69; (Acts vii. 55, 56); Col. iii. 1; Hebr. x. 12.

Thus it is that he records that part of the angelic message in which the death and rising again of Christ were traced in His own words. And the Lord Himself, whether he talks with the two disciples or with the eleven, shows the "necessity" of those events by which their faith was shaken.[1] In this connection the eucharistic meal at Emmaus gains a new meaning. That which was before clearly connected at least with the observances of the Jewish ritual is now separated from all legal observances. The "disappearance" of the Lord is, as it were, a preparation for His unseen presence; and at the same time the revelation to the eleven shows that He raised with Him from the grave, and up to heaven, all that belongs to the perfection of man's nature.[2] The last view which St. Luke gives of the office of the risen Saviour corresponds with the earlier traits in which he shows His relation to mankind. In St. Matthew He is seen as clothed "with all power in heaven and on earth, ... present with the disciples to the end of the age." In St. Mark He is raised to heaven, to a throne of sovereign power, as One to whom nature does homage. In St. Luke He is the High Priest in whose name repentance and remission of sins is to be proclaimed to all nations, — the Mediator who sends forth to men the promise of His Father.

Luke xxiv. 7.

Luke xxiv. 47, 48.

There is yet another aspect in which the Resurrection is presented in the Gospels which can only be indicated now, though it presents lessons of marvellous fulness. St. John traces its effects, not on a church, nor on an active ministry, nor on mankind at large, but on individuals. The picture which he draws can be completed by traits taken from the other Evangelists; and if this be done, there is probably nothing else in the Gospels which gives the same impression of sim-

ST. JOHN.

1 Luke xxiv. 26, οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν; v. 44, δεῖ πληρωθῆναι τὰ γεγραμμένα. Cf. xxiv. 7.

2 Luke xxiv. 36 ff. (σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα).

plicity and comprehensiveness, of independence and harmony, of perfect truthfulness and absolute wisdom. The Resurrection, then as now, is proved to be the touchstone of character. In the presence of this great fact the thoughts of many hearts are revealed. Personal devotion, even if mistaken and limited, is received with a welcome of joy.[1] Hope, which had sunk by a natural and violent reaction even to despair, is cheered by a word of peace, and strengthened to utter the highest confession of faith.[2] Silent love looks and believes.[3] To the eye of the beloved disciple the Lord was known when hidden from others; and while some hastened to embrace or worship Him, it was his part to wait in patience, and in this sense also to tarry till the Lord came.

John xx. 15, 16.

John xx. 24, ff.

John xxi. 7.

However incomplete the comparison between parallel evangelic narratives which has been made in this chapter may be in some of its details, it seems impossible not to feel that it throws a striking light upon the individuality, the independence, and the inspiration of the Gospels. A more complete examination, which should take account of every shade of difference, such as could only be apprehended by personal study, would fill up an outline which is too plain to be easily mistaken. The characteristic traits which have been noticed appear in the records of a series of incidents which have been selected for their intrinsic importance, and not arbitrarily. They are so subtle that no one could attribute them to design; and yet so important that they convey their peculiar effect to the narratives. Without any constant uniformity they converge towards one point; and even when their connection is least apparent, they present a general impression

The results of these characteristic differences.

The Individuality,

1 Matt. xxviii. 9, Χαίρετε. Here only in the Gospels.

2 John xx. 26, 28.

3 John xx. 8, καὶ εἶδεν καὶ ἐπίστευσεν. Cf. Luke xxiv. 12, which is a very ancient gloss, if not a part of the original text.

of a definite law to which they are subject. Diversity of detail is seen to exist without contrariety; and the exhibition of a spiritual purpose with the preservation of literal accuracy.

independence, and

Individuality is a sign of independence. The more exactly any one compares parallel passages of the Gospels the more certainly he will feel that their likenesses are to be referred to the use of a common source, and not to the immediate influence of one Gospel upon another. The general form is evidently derived from some one original type; the special elaboration of it is due to personal knowledge and apprehension of the events included in the fundamental cycle of teaching. The evidence of the evangelists is thus one and yet independent. They do not reproduce one uniform history; but give distinct histories according to the outlines of a comprehensive and common plan.

inspiration of the Evangelists.

We may proceed yet one step further. Individuality and independence, when presented in such a form as to exhibit complementary spiritual aspects of the same facts, are signs of inspiration. From one side it is possible to refer the phenomena which they offer to the mental characteristics of the Evangelists; but it has been seen that the human element is of the essence of inspiration. The Bible is divine *because* it is human. The Holy Spirit speaks through men as they are, and the fulness of their proper character is the medium for conveying the fulness of the truth. It follows, then, that in proportion as it can be shown that there is a distinctness of purpose, though most free from the marks of conscious design, in the several Gospels,—in proportion that there can be shown to exist in them significant differences consistent with absolute truth, there is a sure pledge of their plenary inspiration in the truest and noblest sense of the words. Nothing less than the constant presence of the Holy Spirit, if we can in any way apprehend the method of His working, could

preserve perfect truthfulness with remarkable variations; a perfect plan with childly simplicity; an unbroken spiritual concord in independent histories.

NOTE TO PAGE 321.

ON THE DAY OF THE CRUCIFIXION.

The difficulties connected with the chronology of the Paschal week are acknowledged on all hands to be very considerable, and the various solutions which have been proposed have tended to perplex the question still more by introducing uncertainty into the interpretation of the terms involved. The examination of these difficulties may be divided into two distinct parts, — the determination (1) of the day of the month, and (2) of the day of the week, on which the Lord suffered. Of these the first includes the alleged discrepancy between the Synoptists and St. John as to the time and character of the Last Supper; the second, on the other hand, is chiefly of interest for the interpretation of the Gospels. The two questions are quite independent, and will be considered separately.

1. Direct Evidence.

(a) The Crucifixion on a Preparation Day.

I. All the Evangelists agree as to the *name* of the day of the Crucifixion; and in the absence of all evidence to the contrary, it is entirely unreasonable to suppose that the name is used in more than one sense. The day was *The Preparation* (ἡ παρασκευή), or rather *A Preparation* (παρασκευή).

Matt. xxvii. 62, τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον ἥτις ἐστὶν μετὰ τὴν παρασκευήν.

Mark xv. 42, ἐπεὶ ἦν παρασκευή, ὅ ἐστιν προσάββατον.

Luke xxiii. 54, καὶ ἡμέρα ἦν παρασκευῆς καὶ σάββατον ἐπέφωσκεν.

John xix. 31, ἐπεὶ παρασκευὴ ἦν (cf. v. 42); v. 14, ἦν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα.

What then was the *Parasceue* — The Preparation? There can be no doubt that in early Christian writers, as in modern Greek, this was the name of *Friday* (Clem. Alex. *Str.* vii. p. 877, § 75, ἡ Παρασκευή . . . ἐπιφημίζεται . . . ἡ Ἀφροδίτης. Cf. Polyc. *Mart.* 7, τῇ Παρασκευῇ δείπνου ὥρα. Tertull. *De Jejun.* 14). Friday was indeed *the* preparation for the weekly Sabbath, and as such it was natural that the name should be used for it so commonly that at last it became the proper name of the day.[1] But the name and character of Sabbath was not confined to the weekly day of rest. There were other festival-days which had the same Sabbatic character, and foremost among them the first day of the feast of unleavened

1 The word appears, as it were, in a transition-state in a decree of Augustus preserved by Josephus: *Ant.* xvi. 6, 2, ἐγγύας μὴ ὁμολογεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐν σάββασιν, ἢ τῇ πρὸ ταύτης παρασκευῇ ἀπὸ ὥρας ἐνάτης.

bread (Lev. xxiii. 15, τὰ σάββατα. Cf. *v.* 11, *Hebr. vv.* 24, 39); and thus the day before these festival-sabbaths would likewise include a Preparation, in the same way as that before the weekly sabbaths. All festivals did not partake in this Sabbatic character, and consequently the enumeration of days in Judith (viii. 6, ἐνήστευεν . . . χωρὶς προσαββάτων καὶ σαββάτων, καὶ προνουμηνιῶν καὶ νουμηνιῶν καὶ ἑορτῶν καὶ χαρμοσυνῶν οἴκου Ἰσραήλ) proves nothing as to the exclusive use of the word προσάββατον, by which St. Mark explains παρασκευή, for the weekly Preparation.[1]

(b) The Preparation day fixed by St. John as the Eve of the Passover.

If it is allowed that there is nothing in the Synoptic Gospels, so far as the title of the day is concerned, which determines whether it is to be understood of the weekly or of the festival preparation, St. John seems to leave no real room for doubt. In point of grammar, παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα —the Preparation of the Passover— *might* mean *the Friday in the Paschal week;* but it seems incredible, if we take into consideration the significance of St. John's dates, that the Evangelist should reckon by the week and not by the symbolic feast, of which he is recording the fulfilment.[2] In connection with the whole narrative, "the Preparation of the Passover" cannot mean anything but "the Preparation *for* the Passover," or in other words the fourteenth Nisan, the eve of the Paschal supper, which was eaten at the beginning of the fifteenth Nisan, according to the Jewish reckoning, *i. e.*, after sunset of the fourteenth, according to our own.[3]

(c) The Synoptic dates reconcilable with this conclusion.

The dates furnished by the Synoptists fall in with this interpretation. On "the first day of unleavened bread," which is identified with the fourteenth of Nisan by the significant addition, "When they sacrificed the Paschal-offering" (Mark xiv. 12, τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθυον; Luke xxii. 7, ἡ ἡμ. τ. ἀζ. ἐν ᾗ ἔδει τὸ πάσχα θύεσθαι; Matt. xxvi. 87, τῇ δὲ πρώτῃ τῶν ἀζ), the disciples inquired "where they should prepare the Passover." Then follow in unbroken succession the Last Supper (Matt. xxvi. 20; Mark xiv. 17, ὀψίας γενομένης; Luke xxii. 14, ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα), the departure to Gethsemane (Matt. xxvi. 31; Mark xiv. 27, ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ), the arrest, the examination (Matt. xxvi. 74, and parallels, ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν), the deliberation (Matt. xxvi. 1, πρωΐας γενομένης), and the various steps of the Passion. Now it appears that the

1 M. Lutteroth, in an ingenious essay (*Le Jour de la Préparation*, Paris, 1855), has endeavored to identify the Preparation with the tenth of Nisan, the day on which the offering was set apart. Luke xxii. 7, seems to be decisive against this supposition, and M. Lutteroth appears to feel the difficulty which the most forced interpretation is insufficient to remove.

2 This will be felt at once if we translate John xix. 42, because of the *Friday* of the Jews (Bleek, *Beitr.* 1117).

3 In conformity with this the Jewish tradition represents "the Eve of the Passover" as the time of the Crucifixion (Bleek, *Beitr.* 148). The connection between the two uses of παρασκευὴ is well seen in the connection of עֶרֶב the *eve* of a feast, and עֲרוּבְתָּא *Friday* (Buxt. *Lex.* p. 1659).

fourteenth was kept at a later time as a day of rest *especially in Galilee* (Mishna, *Pesach.* iv. 1, 5; ap. Bleek, *Beitr.* 122[1]), that is probably the natural day, excluding the evening. This fact supports the idea, which is probable in itself, that the question of the disciples was asked immediately upon the sunset of the thirteenth. The Preparation is evidently contemplated as foreseen by the owner of the house, and need not have occupied much time.[2] The evening of the Supper would thus be as St. John represents it, the evening at the beginning of the fourteenth. The same day after sunrise next morning is rightly described as a Preparation-day, — "the Preparation of the Passover," though the Preparation, in the strictest sense of the term, was limited to the last three hours, from "the ninth hour."

2. Indirect Evidence.

This view of the time of the Last Supper is supported by a variety of indirect arguments, common to St. John and the Synoptists, which appear to be so cogent in themselves that many critics who affirm the inconsistency of the two forms of the narrative, assume that the original basis of the Synoptic Gospels presented the same chronology as St. John, and that these coincidences spring from the partial preservation of the first text.

(a) St. John implies that the Passover was not eaten on the Crucifixion Day.

But before noticing these less distinct intimations of the date, there are yet two other passages of St. John which seem to leave no room to doubt his meaning, if it be not clear already. On the morning of the day of the crucifixion the Jews, as he writes, would not enter the judgment-hall of Pilate, "that they may eat the Passover" (John xix. 28, ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα).[3] Nothing but the determination to adapt these words to a theory could suggest the idea that "eating the Passover" applies to anything but the great Paschal meal.[4] Our ignorance as to the custom of the Jews at the time makes it impossible to determine the extent of impurity contracted by entering the house of a heathen, but it would at any rate last till sunset, in which case the person thus impure could not be present at the sacrifice of the offering in the Temple. Nor is it less decisive on the point that towards the close of the evening on which the Last Supper took place, and when it was nearly ended, the disciples thought that Judas

1 Sapientes dicunt, in Judæa operabantur vespera Paschatis (בערב פסחים) usque ad meridiem. Sed *in Galilæa nihil omnino operabantur;* et nocte schola Schammai vetat, schola Hillelis permittit usque ad scintillationem solis. Cf. § 6. The whole chapter is worthy of study in illustration of the care with which even the fourteenth Nisan was observed. Cf. *Pesach.* v. 1, p. 150.

2 Mark xiv. 15, δείξει ἀνώγαιον μέγα ἐστρωμένον ἕτοιμον.

3 The phrase occurs in the account of the institution of the Passover, Exod. xii. 21, θύσατε τὸ πάσχα, and, though the words might perhaps be extended to the keeping of the whole rite, yet they properly describe the sacrificial act as distinguished from the entire festival (ποιεῖν τὸ πάσχα, Num. ix. 2, 6, 20, etc.). Cf. Deut. xvi. 2, 5, 6; Ezra vi. 20, 21, ἔσφαξαν τὸ πάσχα . . . καὶ ἔφαγον τὸ πάσχα.

4 The passages quoted in support of the rendering, "celebrate the feast, by eating the Chagiga," fail in true parallelism (Bleek, *Beitr.* 109 ff.).

was dismissed that he might buy the things which were needed for the feast (John xiii. 29, ὧν χρείαν ἔχομεν εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν), which was already defined as "the feast of the Passover" (xiii. 1, πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα). On the fifteenth such purchases would have been equally illegal and impossible.

(b) St. John and the Synoptists imply that the Crucifixion day was not the fifteenth Nisan (a Sabbath).

This passage leads to the series of other passages already alluded to, which so far determine the day of Crucifixion as to show that it was not fifteenth Nisan. This day — the first day of unleavened bread — was a Sabbath, on which the Sabbatic law of rest was specially binding (Exod. xii. 16; Lev. xviii. 7). Now the Synoptists and St. John alike exclude the notion that the day of the Crucifixion was such a "Sabbath." Apart from the extreme improbability that such a festival as the first day of unleavened bread would be described as "Friday" or "Preparation-day," everything is done without scruple which would have been unlawful on a Sabbath. A commission to make purchases is regarded as natural (John xiii. 29); the Lord and His disciples leave the city contrary to the command (Exod. xii. 22); men come armed for the arrest of Christ[1] (Luke xxii. 52); the Jewish council meets for *judgment;* Simon comes (as it appears) from his ordinary work (Mark xv. 21; Luke xxiii. 26, ἐρχόμενον ἀπ' ἀγροῦ); the condemned are executed and taken down from the crosses, and at the close of the day spices are prepared for the embalming of the Lord (Luke xxiii. 55), and because of the Preparation (that is, of the *approaching* Sabbath) He is laid in a tomb which was near (John xix. 42), whereas if it were the fifteenth, the day itself was a Sabbath.[2] To those familiar by experience with Jewish usages, as all the Evangelists must have been, the whole narrative of the Crucifixion, crowded with incidents of work, would set aside the notion that the day was the fifteenth. Where the idea was excluded by facts, there would be no need of words and no fear of ambiguity; and if we keep clearly in view the Sabbatical character of the fifteenth, we shall be satisfied that all the Evangelists equally forbid us to place the Crucifixion on such a day.

(c) The symbolism of the Passion favors the fourteenth of Nisan.

One or two allusions, which perhaps cannot be urged as arguments without claiming greater authority for the symbolic meaning of Holy Scripture than many would concede, seem to point clearly to the result which has been thus obtained from the positive evidence in favor of the fourteenth Nisan, and the negative evidence against the fifteenth. St. John, by applying to our Lord words from the institution of the Passover,[3] evidently contemplates Him as the true Paschal Lamb, and

1 And this, it may be noticed, when the rulers determined to avoid the feast (Matt. xxvi. 5; Mark xiv. 2, μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ).

2 Bleek (l. c.) quotes authorities to show the illegality of doing the several acts mentioned, on the Sabbath: the enumeration itself seems sufficient for any one acquainted with the Jewish law.

3 John xix. 36, compared with Exod. xii. 46.

the harmony of the narrative is completed by the supposition that the time as well as the mode of the Lord's death coincided with that of the typical victim.[1] St. Paul repeats the same idea more distinctly, 1 Cor. v. 7, τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστός· ὥστε ἑορτάσωμεν κ. τ. λ.; and it has been argued with great plausibility that if he had regarded the institution of the Eucharist as taking place at the Paschal meal, he would not have said simply ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ᾗ παρεδίδετο (1 Cor. xi. 23). Nor is it to be forgotten that these references of St. Paul are the more important as proceeding from a distinct source.

3. Historic Evidence.

On such a point historical tradition may seem to some to be of no great weight, but it is evident that the tendency of any change in the tradition would be towards the identification of the Last Supper with the Paschal meal, and not towards the distinction of the two, if they had been originally connected. Now, as far as appears, early tradition is nearly unanimous in fixing the Crucifixion on the fourteenth, and in distinguishing the Last Supper from the legal Passover.[2] This distinction is expressly made by Apollinaris,[3] Clement of Alexandria,[4] Hippolytus,[5] Tertullian, Irenæus,[6] who represent very different sections of the early Church. Origen, according to the Latin version of his Commentary on St. Matthew, seems to identify the Supper with the legal Passover, but the passage is confused.[7] From the time of Chrysostom the meal was generally identified with the Passover;[8] but Photius expressly notices that two writers who differed widely on other points of the Paschal controversy agreed in fixing the Passion on the fourteenth, contrary to the later opinion of the Church, and therefore reserves the question for examination.[9] The quartodeciman controversy

1 In this aspect the time, the *ninth* hour (Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark xv. 34; Luke xxiii. 44), is very important. This was the beginning of the solemn Preparation (comp. p. 335, n. 1).

2 Cf. Routh, *Rell. Sacr.* i. 168.

3 *Fragm.* ii. ap. Routh, i. p. 160, λέγουσιν [οἱ δι' ἄγνοιαν φιλονεικοῦσι περὶ τούτων] ὅτι τῇ ιδ' τὸ πρόβατον μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν ἔφαγεν ὁ Κύριος, τῇ δὲ μεγάλῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων αὐτὸς ἔπαθεν· καὶ διηγοῦνται Ματθαῖον οὕτω λέγειν ὡς νενοήκασιν. ὅθεν ἀσύμφωνός τε νόμῳ ἡ νόησις αὐτῶν, καὶ στασιάζειν δοκεῖ κατ' αὐτοὺς τὰ εὐαγγέλια. This fragment is specially important as pointing to what may have been the source of the confusion, the different reckoning of the Jewish ecclesiastical and natural days: the evening at the beginning of the fourteenth seems to have been confounded with the evening at the end of the fourteenth (the natural day), *i. e.*, the evening of the fifteenth and the time of the Paschal meal.

Apollinaris (in *Fragm.* iii.) elsewhere states distinctly that the Lord, "the great sacrifice," was crucified and "buried on the day of the Passover," the fourteenth, "the true Passover of our Lord."

4 Clem. Alex. *Fragm.* p. 1016, Pott.

5 Hipp. *Fragm.* i. ii. (p. 869, ed. Migne).

6 Tertull. *adv. Jud.* 8; Iren. iv. 10, 1 (23) (quoted by Browne, *Ordo Sæclorum*, p. 66). Yet Irenæus calls the meal "a Passover" (ii. 22, 2).

7 Orig. *Comm. in Matt.* § 79.

8 The interesting Catena on St. Mark published by Cramer contains both opinions (Cram. *Cat. in Marc.* pp. 420, 421), the second with a reference to St. John.

9 Phot. *Cod.* 115, 116.

itself has no decisive bearing on the date. The evidence as to the point on which the controversy turned is too meagre and ambiguous to allow of any satisfactory conclusions being drawn from it.[1]

Obj. The Synoptic account of the Last Supper.

But in answer to all these arguments which are drawn from direct and indirect evidence of every kind, it is said that the Synoptists plainly speak of the Last Supper as the Paschal meal. It might, perhaps, be enough to answer that they define the day of the Crucifixion at least as plainly, and that St. John, who is in perfect harmony with them as to the day, shows that the meal was not the Paschal meal, as, indeed, it could not be, if it was on "the Preparation-day." Either, then, they must include a gross contradiction in their narrative, or we must misinterpret their meaning as to the day or the meal; and certainly not as to the former, because that is fixed by a complicated chain of evidence, while the other is expressed in one or two phrases which admit readily of a different sense, when once we reflect that the very circumstances of the case must have put out of question for Jews what appears to us to be their most natural meaning. It is said that the disciples speak of "preparing for eating the Passover" (Matt. xxvi. 17; Mark xiv. 12; Luke xxii. 9); that Christ Himself proposes to eat it (Matt. xxvi. 18); Mark xiv. 15; Luke xxii. 8); that the disciples actually "prepared the Passover" (ἡτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα; Matt. xxvi. 19; Mark xiv. 16; Luke xxii. 13); that in the course of the meal which followed immediately afterwards the Lord said, "I desired to eat this Passover with you" (ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν, Luke xxii. 15). If these words stood alone, there can be no doubt that we should explain them of the Paschal meal taken at the legal time; but the Evangelists who use them exclude this sense by their subsequent narrative, and there are in the contexts indications of the sense in which they must be taken. The Lord, in sending His disciples to make the preparation, said, "My time is near" (Matt. xxvi. 18), as if to explain something unusual in His command. He sent, as the words imply, to a disciple who was expecting Him, and speaks with authority as "the Master" (ὁ διδάσκαλος, Matt. xxvi. 18; Mark xiv. 14; Luke xxii. 11). May we not then suppose that the preparation which the disciples may have destined for the next day was made the preparation for an immediate meal which became the Paschal meal of that year, when the events of the following morning rendered the regular Passover impossible?[2] If this seems a forced sense, we must remember that while the memory of events was still fresh, as it was when the oral Gospel was fixed, statements which are perplexing to us may have been readily intelligible from a knowledge of the connecting facts. Nothing at least can be more unlikely than that the narratives should be severally inconsistent with themselves. Ritual difficulties which

How this must be understood.

1 Cf. Bleek, *Beitr.* 156 ff.

2 Hippol. *Fragm.* i. p. 869, οὗτος γὰρ ἦν τὸ πάσχα τὸ προκεκηρυγμένον καὶ τελειούμενον τῇ ὡρισμένῃ ἡμέρᾳ. The use of πάσχα for the Christian Eucharist would render the confusion easier in after time; cf. Mingarelli, *Did. de Trin.* ii. 16.

we can feel only by effort and careful study, would be felt instinctively by the Evangelists. They and their first readers could not have referred the events of the Crucifixion-day to the "Sabbath" on the fifteenth, and consequently could not, as we might do, refer the words which describe the supper which preceded it to the legal Passover.

II. The week-day of the Crucifixion.

II. It remains to notice very briefly the second point of inquiry. Long use and tradition seem to have decided this already, but it may be questioned whether there are not grounds for doubting the correctness of the common opinion. In the record which St. Matthew has preserved of the saying of the Lord as to "the sign of Jonah," it is stated that "the Son of Man shall be three days and *three nights* in the heart of the earth" (Matt. xii. 40, τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας). Admitting that the parts of the days of the burial and the resurrection are to be reckoned as "days," yet even thus the period from Friday till Sunday is only three days and *two* nights. Are we then to conclude that the separate enumeration of days and nights is without any special force, and strictly speaking inaccurate? or to suppose that the term "Preparation-day" has led to the very natural but erroneous identification of the day of the Crucifixion with *Friday*? The evidence on both sides is but slight. On the one hand it may be said that St. John spoke of the Sabbath which followed the Preparation as being of special solemnity (John xix. 31, ἦν δὲ μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνου τοῦ σαββάτου), and this would certainly be the case if the fifteenth of Nisan, a festival Sabbath, coincided with the weekly Sabbath; and so also St. Luke appears to mark only *one* day as intervening between the burial and the resurrection (Luke xxiii. 54, 56, σάββατον ἐπέφωσκεν . . . τὸ μὲν σάββατον ἡσύχασαν). But St. Matthew describes the day after the Crucifixion in so remarkable a manner, as to lead to the belief that he did not regard it as the weekly Sabbath: "The next day that followed the day of the Preparation the chief priests came to Pilate" (τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον, ἥτις ἐστὶν μετὰ τὴν παρασκευήν, Matt. xxvii. 62). Such a circumlocution seems most unnatural if the weekly Sabbath were intended; but if it were the first day of unleavened bread, then, as the proper title of that day had been already used to describe the commencement of the Preparation-day (Matt. xxvi. 17, τῇ δὲ πρώτῃ τῶν ἀζύμων), no characteristic term remained for it. Moreover, the day in itself was a "great Sabbath," and could be described as such by St. John, without supposing any coincidence of the weekly and festival Sabbaths. And the whole Sabbatic period, extending from the beginning of the fifteenth of Nisan to the *dawn* of the first day of the week might, perhaps, without violence be called a Sabbath; or at least the rest on the fifteenth might be implied in the statement of the rest observed on the Sabbath. Such a period would completely satisfy the term fixed by "the sign of Jonah," and the text of the Gospels, with the exception of the one passage in St. Luke, which forms an apparent difficulty, leaves the length of the entombment undetermined, except so far as it is fixed by "the first day of the week," and the legal resting-time which interrupted the preparations of the disciples.[1]

1 The other dates which refer to the interval are: (1) Matt. xxvii. 63, εἶπεν

But without pursuing the question further at present, what has been said may be sufficient to direct attention to the investigation, which seems to call for more notice than has been hitherto given to it.

...μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἐγείρομαι· κέλευσον οὖν; cf. Mark viii. 31, δεῖ...μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστῆναι; Mark ix. 31; x. 34, ἀσφαλισθῆναι τὸν τάφον ἕως τῆς τρίτης ἡμέρας. (2) John ii. 19, λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον καὶ [ἐν] τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν. Cf. Matt. xxvi. 61; Mark xiv. 58; διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν. Matt. xxvii. 40; Mark xv. 29, ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις. (3) Matt. xvi. 21; xvii. 23; xx. 19; Luke ix. 22; xviii. 33; xxiv. 7, 46, τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστῆναι. (4) Luke xxiv. 21, τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν ἄγει. It will scarcely be denied that the obvious meaning of these phrases favors the longer interval, which follows from the strict interpretation of Matt. xii. 40.

CHAPTER VII.

THE DIFFERENCES IN ARRANGEMENT OF THE SYNOPTIC EVANGELISTS.

Le cœur a son ordre. — PASCAL.

Chronological arrangement not to be expected in the Synoptic Gospels.

THE differences of arrangement in the Synoptic Evangelists are more obvious and not less important than the differences in detail. Numerous groups of events present the same arrangement in every case, but other events are transposed, so as to convey a new lesson from the new position in which they stand. While there is very much which is common to all the Synoptists, the incidents peculiar to each produce the same kind of individuality in the whole narratives, as the special details impart to the separate elements of which they are composed. Each Evangelist has a characteristic arrangement, coincident up to a certain point with that of the others, and yet so far different that harmonists are commonly driven to violent expedients — assumptions of the repetition or confusion of similar events — to bring all into agreement. But before taking recourse to such solutions of the difficulty we may fairly ask, whether the order of the Evangelists is a violation or an abandonment of chronological sequence. If the succession of time is subordinated to the succession of idea, then it is but lost labor to seek for a result which our materials are not fitted to produce. The object of the student will be to follow out the course of each revelation of the Truth, and not to frame

annals of the Saviour's Life. There are, indeed, times marked out by marvellous coincidences and significant relations in which we may see something of the symmetry of the divine plan of history, but evidence is wanting to justify the extension of a system of minute dates to the teaching of the Lord. If what has been already said of the fragmentariness of the Gospels be true, and the character and express language of St. John's Gospel seem to be conclusive on this point, then it is from the first unlikely that writings which do not aim at completeness should observe with scrupulous exactness the order of time. Selection is in the one case what arrangement is in the other. The first was guided by an instinctive perception of representative facts; the other by an instinctive perception of their relation to a central idea. An inspired order is the correlative of an inspired abridgment. The existence of the one suggests the existence of the other, or at least removes any presumption against the disregard of the common rule of composition.

The Gospels exhibit few traces of it.

If, however, the text of the Gospel bear clear traces of a systematic attention to chronology, the argument based on a mere analogy which might be expected to hold between matter and form must be set aside. But in fact it is not so. The examination of a few chapters of the Synoptic Gospels will leave little doubt that temporal sequence was not the standard of their arrangement. Their whole structure, as well as their contents, serves to prove that they are memoirs and not histories. Definite marks of time and place are extremely rare; and general indications of temporal or local connection are scarcely more frequent.[1] The ordi-

1 From the time of the Temptation to the Transfiguration I have noticed only the following distinct connections of detailed events:

1. Matt. viii. 18, 34. The storm stilled; the Gadarene demoniacs; the return. So Mark iv. 35 ff. (connecting these events with the great day of Parables: cf. Matt. xiii. 53); Luke viii. 22 ff.

2. Matt. ix. 18, *ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος.* Of the new and old; Jairus' daughter. Cf. Mark v. 22; Luke viii. 41, *καὶ ἰδού*, fixing no connection of time.

nary words of transition are either indefinite or are disjunctive.[1] Outwardly, at first sight, the Synoptic Gospels are more like collections of anecdotes than histories. If

3. Matt. ix. 32, *αὐτῶν δὲ ἐξερχομένων*. The healing of two blind; the healing of a dumb man (peculiar to St. Matthew).

4. Matt. xii. 46, *ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος*; xiii. 1, *ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ* (yet cf. Acts viii. 1). Mark iv. 1, *καὶ πάλιν*. Luke viii. 4, *συνιόντος δὲ ὄχλου*. The blasphemy of Pharisees; the true kindred; the day of Parables. Compare No. 1.

5. Matt. xiv. 22; Mark vi. 45, *εὐθέως ἠνάγκασεν*. The walking on the water immediately after the feeding the five thousand.

6. Matt. xvii. 1; Mark ix. 2, *μεθ' ἡμέρας ἕξ*. Luke ix. 28, *ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτώ*. The coming of the kingdom; the Transfiguration.

7. Mark i. 29, *καὶ εὐθὺς ἐξελθόντες*. Luke iv. 38, *ἀναστὰς δέ* (Matt. viii. 14, *καὶ ἐλθών* . . . no connection: cf. v 23; Mark i. 39). The demoniac in the synagogue; Peter's wife's mother cured.

8. Luke vii. 11, *ἐν τῇ ἑξῆς* (all. *τῷ ἑξῆς*). The centurion's servant; the widow's son.

These data are evidently insufficient to determine one certain order of events; nor are the ambiguities removed by taking into account the notices that some events followed others: Matt. ix. 9, 27; xii. 9, 15; xv. 21, 29.

It may be observed that the style of St. Matthew produces the greatest appearance of continuity, though probably he offers the most numerous divergences from chronological order. (Cf. Matt. viii. 1, *ὄχλοι πολλοί*; 2—4, *καὶ ἰδού . . . μηδενὶ εἴπῃς*: 5, *εἰσελθόντος*; 14, *καὶ ἐλθών*; 18, *ἰδὼν δέ*; 23, *καὶ ἐμβάντι*; xiv. 13, 14). St Luke, on the other hand, is the least connected. The great series of events which he connects with the last journey to Jerusalem (xi.—xvii.), is at once one of the strongest arguments against the observance of time by the Evangelists, and the most striking illustration of their mode of connection.

[1] In this respect the usage of each Evangelist is peculiar. The following connecting phrases may be noticed:

1. In St. Matthew:

(*a*) *Τότε* (*at that time;* no close sequence. The word does not occur in this manner in St. Mark; cf. Luke xxi. 10) iii. 5, 13; (iv. 1); ix. 14, 37 (cf. v. 35); xi. 20; xii. 22, 33; (xiii. 36;) xv. 1, 12; xvi. 24; xviii. 21; xix. 13, 27; xx. 20; xxiii. 1. In iv. 1; xiii. 33, it marks a direct sequence.

(*b*) *δέ*, iv. 18; v. 1; viii. 18; xi. 2; xv. 32; xvi. 13.

(*c*) *καί*, iv. 23; viii. 14; ix. 2, 9, 27, 35; x. 1; xii. 9; xv. 21; xvi. 1, 5.

(*d*) *ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ*, xi. 25; xii. 1; xiv. 1. *ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ*, xviii. 1. *ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις*, iii. 1. *ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ*, xiii. 1.

(*e*) To these may be added the use of *ἐκεῖθεν*, ix. 9, 27; xii. 9, 15; xiii. 53; xv. 21, 29.

2. In St. Mark:

(*a*) *καὶ . . . πάλιν*, ii. 1, 13; iii. 1; iv. 1 (*καὶ πάλιν*); vii. 31 (*καὶ πάλιν*); viii. 1, *ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις πάλιν*.

(*b*) *καί*, i. 21, 40; ii. 18, 23; iii. 7, 13, 20, 31; iv. 21, 24, 26, 30; vi. 1, 7, 14, 30; vii. 1, 23; viii. 22, 27.

3. In St. Luke:

(*a*) *καὶ ἐγένετο* (*ἐγένετο δέ*) (occurs in St. Luke forty-one times; in St. Mark twice; in St. Matthew, *καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν* (*συνετ.* viii. 28), five times: else once, ix. 10), v. 1, 12, 17; vi. 1, 6, 12; vii. 11; viii. 1, 22; ix. 18; xi. 1; xx. 1.

(*b*) *καί*, iv. 16, 31; vii. 18; viii. 26; ix. 10, 57; x. 25.

(*c*) *δέ*, vii. 36; viii. 19; ix. 1, 7, 43, 46; x. 1, 17.

The connections of xi.—xvii. will be noticed afterwards.

we compare any series of incidents which they contain with a similar series in any historian, ancient or modern, we shall find at once that, apart from all other differences, there is a fundamental difference in the way in which the incidents are put together. In the one the circumstances of time and place rule the combination; in the other the spiritual import, not independent of these, but yet rising above them, is distinctly predominant.

The order of time generally coincident with a spiritual order.

But while it is maintained that the separate Gospels are not to be forced into any chronological harmony; that the law of their composition is moral and not temporal; that there is a progressive development in the several histories, to neglect which is to lose the very outline of their divine meaning; yet the order of time, as far as it can be ascertained, is not to be neglected. The occasion frequently gives its character to the action. A marked connection brings out with unerring power some latent trait which might otherwise have been overlooked.[1] Thus it is that particular days seem to stand out with signal prominence in the history of Christ, as portraying a crisis of faith and unbelief in a rapid concurrence of events.[2] The days themselves stand isolated, while as distinct wholes they have an internal unity. But beyond such a limited influence of time as this, there is an influence which extends to a much wider range. In the perfect Life all succession proceeds by a supreme law. The progress in the lessons which it unfolds will answer absolutely, as among men partially, to its outward development. It is, then, impossible but that there

1 The healing of the woman with the issue, which in all the accounts interrupts the history of the raising of Jairus' daughter, offers the most remarkable illustration of this. The beginning of the woman's plague was coeval with the maiden's birth. The one had suffered for twelve years when she was made whole; the other had lived for twelve years when she fell asleep to receive a new life. It is impossible not to recognize in this a typical meaning. The faith of the Gentiles seizes the gift which is destined for the Jew. This is beautifully brought out by Hilary, *In Matt.* ix. § 6.

2 Two such days may be noticed: Luke iv. 33—42, a day of faith; Mark iii. 22—v. 22, a day of opposition, warning, power.

should be some broad lines of agreement in order between records of Christ's work based on its varied spiritual meanings. General agreement will be diversified by characteristic divergences. The agreement will be sufficiently wide to convey to us some sense of the infinite harmony of every part and relation of the human life of the Saviour; the divergence sufficiently striking to save us from sacrificing the manifold bearings of eternal truth to a rigid order of time.

The Harmony of the Gospels to be sought in the combination of the purposes which they work out.

If this view be correct, the technical work of the harmonist is limited to a narrow compass. When he has shown that the few incidental fixed dates in the Gospels are consistent with one another, all objections drawn from the discordant order which they present otherwise fall to the ground. He is then free to interpret the letter by the spirit; and to lay open that inner harmony which springs out of the union of various purposes, and leads to the full portraiture of a divine work. The reality of such a harmony is involved, as we have seen, in the very idea of Inspiration, and it is, perhaps, a corollary from the existence of a four-fold record. Yet it is to be felt rather than analyzed. The subtlest signs by which it is characterized vanish in the rude process of dissection. To present it clearly, and even then very inadequately, would be to write a commentary on the Gospels; and for the present it must be enough if we can determine some of the great features by which it appears to be distinguished.

I. St. Matthew's Gospel. The History of the promised Messiah. The Introduction (i. ii.)

We have already seen that St. Matthew connects the beginning of the Gospel-history with the glories of the typical kingdom and the hopes of the first covenant. At the very outset he announces the Messiah as the *son of David* and *the son of Abraham*, the *branch* and *seed* to which all prophecy looked. The genealogy, confined within the limits of the national promise, is the introduc-

tion to his narrative; the birth of the Christ[1] his first subject. The inner scope of the whole Gospel is directed to the development of this idea in the light of ancient revelation.[2] The fear of Joseph is connected with the righteousness of the law; and the imperfection of this righteousness is at once intimated by the

Matt. i. 18.

1 There can be little doubt that the correct reading in Matt. i. 18, is τοῦ δὲ Χριστοῦ ἡ γένεσις οὕτως ἦν.

2 The following analysis may guide the student in pursuing the teaching of St. Matthew.

INTRODUCTION. i., ii.

The Royal pedigree (i. 1—17).
The Virgin's Son, the promised Saviour (18—25).
The homage (ii. 1—12).
The persecution (13—23).
(In all the words of prophets are fulfilled.)

1. THE PRELUDE. iii., iv.

(*a*) *The Baptist* (iii.):
The Messenger (1—6). The Message (7—12). The Recognition (13—17).

(*b*) *The Messiah* (iv):
The Trial (1—11). The Home (12—16). The Message (17). The Call (18—22). The Work (23—25).

2. THE LAWGIVER AND PROPHET. v.—xiii.

(*a*) *The new Law in relation to the old* (v.—vii.)

(*b*) *The testimony of signs* (viii., ix.).

Characteristics (viii. 1—15).
The Suppliant (Resignation, 1—4); the Intercessor (Faith, 5—13); the Restored (Service, 14, 15).
The Lord and the Disciples (viii. 18—ix. 17).
Self-denial (18—22).
Power (Nature, 23—27; Spirits, 28—34; Sin, ix. 1—8).
Mercy (9—13).
Prudence (14—17).
The Results (ix. 18—34).
Faith confirmed (20—22); raised (23—26); attested (27—31).
Unbelief hardened (32—34).

(*c*) *The Commission* (ix. 36—xi.).

The Charge (x.).
The Hearers (xi.).
John (1—15); the People (16—19).
Woes (20—24); Thanksgivings (25—30).

(*d*) *The Contrast* (xii.).

The letter and the spirit of the Law.
Example (1—9); Miracle (10—13).
The kingdom of Satan and the kingdom of God (22—37).

reference to *the sins of the people* from which Christ should save them. But the holy name Jesus — symbolical at once of the ancient triumphs of Israel and of the future triumphs of the Church — is merged *Matt. i. 21.*

The sign of Jonas (38—45).
Natural and spiritual kindred (46—50).

(*e*) *Parables of the kingdom:* its rise, growth, consummation (xiii.).

II. The King. xiv.—xxv.

(*a*) *The character of the King*, compared with
Temporal dominion:
The feast of Herod; death of John (xiv. 1—12).
The feast of Christ (Jews); the disciples saved (13—33).
Hierarchical dominion:
The tradition of the elders (xv. 1—20).
The Syrophœnician heard (21—28).
The Gentiles healed and fed (29—39).
Truth hidden from some (xvi. 1—12), revealed to others (13—20).

(*b*) *Glimpses of the kingdom.*
The prospect of suffering (xvi. 24—28).
The vision of glory (xvii. 1—13).
The secret source of strength (14—21).
The citizens.
Moral principles: Obedience: a sign (xvii. 24—27); Humility, Unselfishness, Forgiveness (xviii.).
Social characteristics: Marriage, children, riches, sacrifice (xix.).
Yet all without intrinsic merit (xx. 1—16).

(*c*) *The King claims his heritage.*
The Journey (xx. 17—34)
The triumphal Entrance (xxi. 1—17).
The Conflict (xxi. 18—xxii.).
The sign (xxi. 18—22). The first question (23—27). The portraiture (28—xxii. 14). The temptation (15—40). The last question (41—46).
The Judgment (xxiii.—xxv.).
The Teachers (xxiii.).
The City (xxiv.).
The World (xxv.).

4. Death the Gate of the Eternal Kingdom. xxvi.—xxviii.

(*a*) *The Passion* (xxvi., xxvii.).
Contrasts: foreknowledge, craft (xxvi. 1—8).
love, treason (6—16).
The Last Supper: woes foreseen and faced (17—29).
The rash promise: power misjudged (30—35).
The inward Agony (36—46).
The outward Desertion (37—56).
The Confession of Christ (57—68).

for the moment in that mysterious title which was consecrated by the memory of an ancient deliverance. The sense of God's personal presence, which, when shadowed forth in former times, had sustained the king of Judah against the armies of Syria and Damascus, is at length confirmed by a literal fulfilment of the symbol. *Immanuel* is no longer a figure, but a truth. The parable becomes a fact; the word of hope, a confession of faith.

Is. vii.

The first chapter declares the title of Messiah, the second foreshows His reception. Adoration on the one side, persecution on the other; the ministry of the powers of heaven, the tyranny of the powers of earth; bloodshed and flight and exile; such are the beginnings of the kingdom. He who is saluted by prophets as *God with us*, is, according to the tenor of their teaching, a *Nazarene*, poor and despised, in the eyes of men.

Matt. ii. 23.

So far we have a preface to the Gospel pregnant with symbolic facts. Next follows a brief summary of Messiah's work, presented in a rapid contrast between His preaching and the preaching of His herald. Both proclaim the same message.[1] Both choose the field of their labor according to the declarations of prophecy. But with this the resemblance ends. The work of John is that of the Law, to awaken and convict.

1. *The Prelude.* (*iii. iv.*)

Matt. iii. 3; iv. 14 ff.

The denial of Peter (69—75).
The death of Judas (xxvii. 3—10).
The death of Christ (11—50).
Christ and Barabbas (15—26). Christ and the soldiers (27—31).
Christ and the bystanders (32—56).
The Burial (57—61). The watch (62—66).

(*b*) *The Triumph.*

The Rising in glory (1—10).
The false report (11—15).
The great commission (16—20).

1 Matt. iii. 2; iv. 17, Μετανοεῖτε, ἤγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. It may be doubted whether the true reading in the second case is not simply Ἤγγικεν ἡ βασ. τ. οὐρ. See Scholz *ad loc.*

He confronts the two great sections of the Jewish Church[1] with terrible denunciations against the prescriptive holiness of descent and ritual. For hope he points only to Him who should come. In act, if not in word, he acknowledges the fulfilment of his office in the recognition of Messiah.[2] And then the scene changes. The wilderness, which was the place of John's teaching, is the place of Christ's Temptation. When John is cast into prison, Christ definitely begins His work.[3] Instead of repelling or dismissing men, Christ calls them to follow Him and share His labor. He announces in the synagogues *the Gospel of the kingdom*,[4] and confirms His word by signs of power and love.

Matt. iii. 7.

Matt. iii. 1; iv. 1.

Matt. iv. 18 ff.

Matt. iv. 23 ff.

From this point we are led to regard our Lord more in detail under His different offices, as Lawgiver, Prophet, and King. One trait prepares the way for the other, so that it is difficult to make a very definite line of demarcation between the different sections of the history; but, while the transitions are gradual, the general progress of idea is beyond question. The beginning is a counterpart of the revelation from Sinai; the close a fulfilment of the covenant with David.[5]

2. The Messiah as Lawgiver and Prophet. (v.—xiii.)

In this aspect the Sermon on the Mount is first seen in its true bearing on the scope of St. Matthew. That which was for St. Luke but as one discourse among many, was for St. Matthew the introduction and key to all.[6] The phrase with which it is

(a) The New Law. (v.—viii.)

1 From not observing the point of this, some have felt a difficulty at the mention of these sects. St. Matthew gives the relation of the *religious* parties of the Jews to John, as St. Luke of each *social* class. Both form together a whole: τ ὼ ν Φαρ. καὶ Σαδδ.

2 Thus he yields to the words, πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην (Matt. iii. 15). Compare John i. 31.

3 Matt. iv. 12, 17. Yet He had taught before: John iii. 22 ff.

4 Matt. iv. 23, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας. The phrase is characteristic of St. Matthew, ix. 35 (a remarkable parallel); xxiv. 14. In Mark i. 14, it is a false reading.

5 Matt. xxviii. 18, 20.

6 There cannot, I think, be any reasonable doubt that the discourse related

opened marks the solemn majesty of its delivery.[1] Words of blessing are the preface of the new dispensation.[2] Step by step the nature of Christ is unfolded as the consummation of the Jewish Theocracy.[3] The great features of the

in Luke vi. 20 ff. is the same as that related by St. Matthew. The differences on which some have laid stress vanish upon an accurate examination of the text. The scene in St. Matthew is τὸ ὄρος (v. 1), a word of general meaning: St. Luke defines the spot more precisely as τόπος πεδινός (vi. 17, not πεδίον), a plateau on the mountain, below its highest peak (καταβάς), such as would naturally be chosen for addressing a multitude. I see no contradiction between ἔστη in Luke vi. 17, and καθίσαντος αὐτοῦ in Matt. v. 1. The words refer to different moments, and St. Luke preserves a trait of the latter in vi. 20, ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς μαθητάς.

1 Matt. v. 1, ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα (cf. Eph. vi. 9). Spanheim, *Dub. Evang.* iii. p. 375. In *v.* 21 ff. ἀρχαίοις is certainly (as apparently all the ancient versions) "*to* the men of old." Cf. Rom. ix. 12 (ix. 20 LXX); Gal. iii. 16; Apoc. vi. 11; ix. 4; Matt. xxii. 31.

2 It is worthy of remark that the Kingdom is noticed in the first and last (v. 3, 10); nor would it be difficult to point out a relation observed in the order of the blessings. Verses 4 and 5 in E. V. should be transposed.

3 The following outline of the Sermon on the Mount will make this clearer: —

1. The Citizens of the Kingdom (v. 1—16).
   - (*a*) Their character (1—12).
     In themselves (3—6).
     Poor in spirit. Meek. Sorrowing. Hungering after righteousness.
     Relatively (7—12).
     Merciful to men. Peace towards God. Pursuing peace. Persecuted.
     The example of the prophets.
   - (*b*) Their influence (13—16).
     To preserve (13). To guide (14—16).
2. The New Law (17—48).
   - (*a*) The fulfilment of the Old generally (17—20).
   - (*b*) The fulfilment of the spirit of special commandments.
     Murder. Adultery. Perjury. Revenge. Exclusiveness. (21—48.)
3. The New Life (vi.—vii. 23).
   - (*a*) Acts of devotion (vi. 1—18).
     Alms (1—4). Prayer (5—15). Fasting (16—18).
   - (*b*) Aims (19—34).
     The true treasure (19—21).
     The single service (22—24).
     The perfect repose (25—34).
   - (*c*) Conduct vii. (1—12).
     Charitable in judging (1—5).
     Circumspect in teaching (6).
     Faithful in well-doing (7—12).

Christian commonwealth, the character[1] and influence of its citizens, the principles of the Christian law, and the practice of the Christian life, are deduced from the ordinances, and often expressed in the words, of the Old Testament. The voice which speaks is one of absolute authority, but it proclaims everywhere not abrogation but fulfilment.

The promulgation of the new Law is followed by the record of a series of miracles[2] which enforce and explain the true position and authority of the Lawgiver. He fulfils the spirit of the Law and acknowledges its claims, while He violates the

(b) The testimony of signs. (viii. ix.)

Matt. viii. 1—17.

(*d*) Dangers (vii. 13—23).
From himself (13, 14).
From false teachers (15), to be tested by
Works of faith (16—20), not by
Works of power (21—23).

4. THE GREAT CONTRAST (vii. 24—27).

1 If we represent to ourselves the company, the emphatic ὑμεῖς in v. 13, 14 will appear very striking.

2 The following scheme of the Miracles recorded by St. Matthew will serve to show their relation to the framework of his Gospel. No one scheme, of course, can exhaust the lessons of the miracles. This only shows their bearing in succession upon one great idea. The miracles peculiar to St. Matthew are marked by italics:

1. THE MIRACLES OF THE LAWGIVER.
(*a*) In relation to the Old Law.
a. The spirit before the letter (*v*. 3).
The leper cleansed (viii. 2—4).
b. Faith before descent (*v*. 10).
The healing of the centurion's servant (viii. 5—13).
c. The service of love before ritual observance (*v*. 14).
The healing of Peter's wife's mother (viii. 14, 15).
[Many healed, as Esaias prophesied, viii. 16, 17.]
(*b*) In Himself, as all powerful over,
a. The material world.
The stilling of the storm (viii. 23—27).
b. The spiritual world.
The Gadarene dæmoniacs healed (viii. 28—34).
c. The power of sin.
The paralytic healed (ix. 1—8).
(*c*) In relation to man, as requiring faith:
a. Actively, to seize the blessing.
The woman with issue healed (ix. 20—22).
b. Passively, to receive it.
Jairus' daughter raised (ix. 18—26).

letter;[1] He points to faith, and not inheritance, as the basis of His kingdom; He shows that active gratitude for God's mercies is unrestrained by ceremonial injunctions.[2] Or, to regard the subject from another point of sight, the same miracles indicate in succession the certainty, the spirituality, and the completeness of His works; and if we turn from the works themselves to those for whom they were wrought, we notice resignation as the true mark of the suppliant; faith, of the intercessor; service, of the restored. Outcast, stranger, and friend, are alike heard. All is, indeed, infinite

c. As a measure of the blessing (*v.* 29).
The two blind men (ix. 27—31).
d. As the means of understanding it.
The dumb devil cast out (ix. 32—34).
[Many healed, ix. 35.]

2. THE MIRACLES OF THE PROPHET OF THE KINGDOM.
(*a*) Vindicating the law of conscience (in *Action*).
The withered hand healed (xii. 10—14).
(*b*) Rescuing the sight and speech from the power of evil.
The blind and dumb devil cast out (xii. 22—30).

3. THE MIRACLES OF THE KING.
(*a*) As to His people.
a. Jews.
In relief of want.
Feeding of the five thousand (xiv. 15—21).
In relief of toil (*v.* 24).
Walking on the sea (xiv. 22—33).
b. Gentiles.
In answer to prayer.
The woman of Canaan (xv. 21—28).
[Many healed, xv. 30, 31.]
In reward of patience (*v.* 32).
The feeding of the four thousand (xv. 32—39).
(*b*) As to His title.
a. Perfect by human preparation (*v.* 21).
Healing the lunatic (xvii. 14—21).
b. Legitimate by divine right (*vv.* 25, 26).
The stater in the fish (xvi. 24—27).
[Many healed, xxi. 2.]
(*c*) As to His government.
a. Merciful according to our prayer (*v.* 32).
The two blind men healed (xx. 30—34).
b. Just according to our fruits (*vv.* 19—22).
The fig-tree cursed (xxi. 17—22).

1 It was unlawful to touch a leper: Matt. viii. 3; Lev. v. 3.
2 Matt. viii. 16 indicates that the miracle was wrought on the Sabbath. Cf. Luke iv. 31, 38.

because it is divine. The significance of the signs deepens as we look to their different bearings.

The common relation of Christ to the people being thus indicated, He is seen in a clear relation to His disciples. He claims perfect self-denial and he exhibits perfect power and mercy and wisdom. The material and spiritual worlds obey His voice: the bands of sin are loosened by His word. But, at the same time, faith is exhibited as the measure of man's blessing, and the means whereby he may recognize the presence and the power of God. The outward cure is the image of an unseen salvation. The blind do not see till they believe; and when utterance is given to the dumb, the Pharisees can say that the devil is *cast out through the prince of the devils.*

Matt. viii. 18—*ix.*

Matt. ix. 29.
Matt. ix. 6, 22.
Matt. ix. 28.

Matt. ix. 34.

The character of the Lawgiver next passes into that of the Prophet. The mission of the apostles is the public establishment of the kingdom, of which the nature and authority are already declared. Discourses predominate largely over miracles. The facts are constructive and not initiatory. The great charge is placed in vivid juxtaposition with a portraiture of the people among whom the apostles should work. Woes are balanced by thanksgivings. The true disciples are shown to be, not the wise, but the simple; not the spectators of mighty miracles, but the meek and lowly of heart. Then follows a contrast which penetrates the whole range of life. The letter and the spirit of the Law are contrasted by the light of Scripture,[1] of reason, of miracle; the kingdom of Satan with the kingdom of God; the sign of Jonas with the questionings of the Jews; the kindred of blood with the kindred of the spirit. And at this

(c) The Commission.

Matt. x.
Matt. xi. 1—19; 20—30.

(d) The Contrast.
Matt. xii. 1—13.

Matt. xii. 22—37; *xii.* 38—45.
Matt. xii. 46—50.

[1] The remarkable passage, *vv.* 5—7, is peculiar to St. Matthew.

point, while the multitudes press to hear, the formation and growth of "the kingdom" in its widest relations is explained by analogies from the natural world,[1] rich in instruction for the believing, and mere riddles for the faithless.[2] We read

(e) Parables of the kingdom. Matt. xiii. 1—52.

1 The following are the Parables recorded in St. Matthew, which, it will be seen, fall into two divisions, which correspond with the Prophetic and Kingly aspects of Christ's character, as seen before in the record of the miracles, and in the general plan of the Gospel. The parables peculiar to St. Matthew are marked by italics:

1. IMAGES OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF CHRISTIANITY.
   - (*a*) Its source.
     - *a.* From God.
       The sower (xiii. 3—8).
     - *b.* Yet counterfeited by the devil.
       The tares (xiii. 24—30).
   - (*b*) Its progress.
     - *a.* In outward extent.
       The mustard-seed (xiii. 31, 32).
     - *b.* In inward influence.
       The leaven (xiii. 33).
   - (*c*) Its relation to men.
     - *a.* As a gift from heaven.
       The hid treasure (xiii. 44).
     - *b.* As a power in the individual.
       The merchant seeking pearls (xiii. 45, 46).
     - *c.* As a wide-working instrument.
       The drawnet (xiii. 47—50).
2. IMAGES OF THE LIFE OF MEN.
   - (*a*) Love.
     - *a.* A spontaneous feeling.
       The lost sheep (xviii. 12—14).
     - *b.* A debt due to God.
       The unmerciful servant (xviii. 23—25).
   - (*b*) Dependence.
     The laborers in the vineyard (xx. 1—16).
   - (*c*) Activity.
     - *a.* Obedient in spirit, as of sons of God.
       The two sons (xxi. 28—32).
     - *b.* Unselfish, as of stewards of God.
       The wicked husbandmen (xxi. 33—41).
   - (*d*) Reverence.
     The marriage of the king's son (xxii. 1—14).
   - (*e*) Responsibility.
     - *a.* At all times.
       The ten virgins (xxv. 1—13).
     - *b.* In all positions.
       The talents (xxv. 14—30).

2 St. Matthew alone expressly gives Christ's reference to prophecy as explanatory of His teaching, *vv.* 14, 15. It is *implied* in the other accounts.

of the Divine power which founds it, and of the simultaneous influence of evil;[1] of its outward majesty and of its inward power; of its objective value and of its subjective claims;[2] and, lastly, of its universality. On earth confusion and error prevail to the last, but there will be a day of final separation. Christ Himself is no prophet in His own country. He does there few mighty works because of their unbelief; and yet He is preparing to claim His royal inheritance.

Matt. xiii. 53 ff.

The royal dignity of Messiah is introduced by an incident which, but for this connection, appears to break the tenor of the history. The tyranny of an earthly sovereign — the feast of Herod and the death of John — stands in clear opposition to the love of Him whose compassion was moved by the sight of the gathered multitudes, so that He healed and fed them in the wilderness. Herod, though grieved, works murder; Christ saves even beyond the extent of man's hope. Temporal dominion presents one side of the contrast: hierarchical dominion, the other. The tradition of the elders is set aside as opposing the Law of God; and the blessings extended to Jews are now symbolically assured to Gentiles, as citizens of the future kingdom. The faith of the Canaanite and the patience of the waiting multitude win the help which

3. *The Messiah as King.*

Matt. xiv.—xxv.

(a) *The character of the King, as compared with earthly and hierarchical dominion.*

Matt. xiv. 1—33.

Matt. xv. 1—29.

1 The real force of this parable (24—30) seems to have been lost by not attending to the word ὡμοιώθη, as distinguished from ὁμοία ἐστί. The Church is subject to *outward* influence: it is *made* like to some things, as it *is* like to others. Cf. xviii. 23; xxii. 2; xxv. 1. The full force of ζιζάνια, which had the semblance but not the fruit of wheat, is well given in the words of Origen: Non solum est sermo Christus, et est sermo Antichristus: veritas Christus, et simulata veritas Antichristus: sapientia Christus, est simulata sapientia Antichristus . . . quoniam omnes species boni quascunque habet Christus in se in veritate ad ædificationem hominum, omnes eas habet in se diabolus in specie ad seductionem sanctorum. (*Comm. in Matt.* 33.)

2 xiii. 45, ὁμοία . . . ἀνθρώπῳ . . . ζητοῦντι not ὁμοία μαργαρίτῃ as in *v.* 44. The spirit of the kingdom works in the man. In 44, 45, 47, a threefold form of image is given, corresponding to a threefold aspect of the operation of the Gospel (θησαυρῷ, ἀνθρώπῳ, σαγήνῃ).

excites the surprise of the disciples. Yet even thus it is not given to all to see Christ. The signs of the times are unintelligible to the blind of heart; while to the faithful God Himself reveals the deepest mysteries.

Matt. xvi. 1–20.

St. Peter's inspired confession opens the way to further glimpses of the kingdom. Yet the earliest manifestation of Christ's glory, like the splendor of the eastern sky, betokens the coming storm. The announcement of shame and sorrow and death is the introduction to the vision of majesty. The Transfiguration of Messiah is connected with the first distinct announcement of His sufferings, with the prospect of His human conflict, and the vindication of His divine right. Thenceforth He speaks more in detail of the citizens of the kingdom: of their moving principles, obedience, humility, unselfishness, forgiveness; and of their social characteristics, of the rights of marriage, as a religious bond; of the duties of wealth, as a blessing derived only from God. Yet all claims of merit are excluded. *Many first shall be last.* The warning voice of the parable which closes the section shows that our reward rests in God's good pleasure.

(b) Glimpses of the Kingdom.
Matt. xvi. 3.
Matt. xvi. 24–28.
Matt. xvii. 21, 26.
Matt. xvii. 24–xviii.
Matt. xix.
Matt. xx. 1–16.

The journey to Jerusalem presents once again the conflict between the hopes of the disciples and the work of Christ. Their prayer for dignity is answered by the foretelling of suffering; and on the other hand, the eyes of the blind are opened, though the multitude rebukes them, as they cry for mercy to *the Son of David.*[1] The title of Messiah, with which

(c) The King claims His heritage.
Matt. xx. 20–34.

[1] It is worthy of notice that this phrase is used in the one other place in which sight is restored to the blind at their own prayer: Matt. ix. 27. We may feel that the act of faith which acknowledges Jesus as the Messiah restores true vision to man. In Mark viii. 22, sight is restored by intercession; in John ix. 3, 4, by a direct act of divine mercy: so many are the ways in which God enlightens us. Cf. Matt. xii. 23; xv. 22; xxi. 9, 15.

the Gospel began, is thus resumed at its close.[1] In virtue of His royal power He purifies the temple of God, and marks by a type the national barrenness of Israel, — a disobedient and faithless people. Then follows the conflict. The question of cavillers is followed by a portraiture of their character. The political objections of the Herodian, the intellectual difficulties of the Sadducee, the legal disputes of the Pharisee, are answered.[2] A counter question closes finally this second Temptation; and a triple judgment pronounced on the teachers, on the city, on the world, prepares the way for the Passion. The record of the public ministry of Christ ends where it began, in the teaching of the Law. But woes answer to blessings; the sentence of the Scribes to the Sermon to the multitudes: the first had declared the fulfilment of the spirit of Judaism, the last exposes the corruption of its practice. And when Christ turns to His disciples the words of judgment still remain. He destroys their present hope of an earthly kingdom by prophesying the destruction of Jerusalem; and, yet more, He passes onward to the end of the outward Christian Church, to that final day when the *Son of man shall sit on the throne of His glory, and judge all nations as their King*.[3]

Matt. xxi. 18–22.

Matt. xxi. 23–*xxii.*

Matt. xxii. 41–46.
Matt. xxiii.–*xxv.*

4. *Death, the gate of the Eternal Kingdom.*
(*a*) *The Passion.*

The narrative of the Passion, like so much else in St. Matthew, proceeds by contrasts. Calm foreknowledge and restless craft; devotion and treachery; the advance to death and the rash promise; the inward agony and the outward desertion,

1 The multitudes, and afterwards the children, cry: Hosanna to the Son of David (Matt. xxi. 9, 15). This salutation does not occur in the other Gospels.

2 The variety of language of the Evangelists gives a full picture of the spirit of Christ's enemies: Matt. xxii. 18, *γνοὺς τὴν πονηρίαν*. Mark xii. 15, *εἰδὼς τὴν ὑπόκρισιν*. Luke xx. 23, *κατανοήσας τὴν πανουργίαν*.

3 Matt. xxv. 31. The whole discourse is peculiar to St. Matthew; and this is the only place in which our Lord assumes the title of King. Cf. Matt. v. 35; xxi. 5; Luke xix. 38; John xix. 27.

The reader of Plato will call to mind the magnificent myth of Er the Armenian (Zoroaster, Clem. Alex. *Str.* v. § 104): *Resp.* x. pp. 614 ff.

heighten the effect of a picture which only familiarity can weaken. And the contrast does not end even here. The confession of the Lord and the denial of the servant; the death of Judas and the death of Christ; the care of friends and the vigilance of enemies, carry it on to the last with a divine power. Love still lingers by the grave which seemed to be closed over all hope.

Matt. xxvii. 61.

(b) The Triumph.

The history of the Resurrection completes the lesson of the whole Gospel. We have passed from the spirit of the Mosaic Law to the foundation of the Church, and the inspiring strength of the Atonement. The temporal hopes of the ancient people have been gradually replaced by their spiritual antitypes; the costly offerings of the Magi by the precious ointment of a believing woman; the adoration of sages by the simple faith of a despised Canaanite. Yet once again the Lawgiver of the New Covenant addressed His disciples from the Galilean mountain, but He dwelt no longer on the people of the past, but on the Church of the future: the commandments to the men of old were fulfilled in the teaching of Christianity. Once again the promised King appeared, and received the homage of His subjects, but it was as the Lord of heaven and earth, and not as the Prince of Israel. Once again the Prophet of our Faith spoke comfort to His Apostles, while He assured to them the essence of the theocratic rule in the promise of the abiding presence of Immanuel: *Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world.*[1]

Matt. xxviii. 16, 19.

Matt. xxviii. 19.

xxviii. 20.

1 The Gospel of St. Matthew is not very broadly characterized in language or construction. The style is not nearly so Hebraizing as that of St. John, nor is the language so rich as that of St. Mark. Yet there are some words and phrases which mark the Hebrew Evangelist. Among these the following are the most important: —

1. Ἡ *βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν* (מַלְכוּת הַשָּׁמַיִם). The kingdom *of heaven*, which occurs thirty-two times in St. Matthew, and not in the other Evangelists, who use in parallel passages

The Gospel of St. Mark offers a great contrast to that of St. Matthew in its general effect. The peculiarities of language and minuteness of detail which are least observable in St. Matthew are most obvious in St. Mark; and, conversely, St. Mark offers nothing which answers to the long expositions of the Lord's teaching in St. Matthew. This fundamental difference is seen at once in the relative proportion in which the records of miracles and parables stand to one another in St. Mark. The number of miracles which he gives is scarcely less

II. St. Mark. *Christ working among men.*

The Gospel of action.

ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, the kingdom *of God*. (Matt. vi. 33; xii. 28; xxi. 31, 43.)

2. ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐν οὐρανοῖς (ὁ οὐράνιος), which occurs fifteen times in St. Matthew, twice in St. Mark, and not at all in St. Luke (in xi. 2, it is a false reading). Generally it will be observed that οἱ οὐρανοὶ is the seat of the heavenly powers; ὁ οὐρανὸς the physical heaven.

3. Υἱὸς Δανείδ, seven times in St. Matthew, three times each in St. Mark and St. Luke.

4. ἡ ἁγία πόλις, the Holy City. Matt. iv. 5; xxvii. 53. Not in the other Evangelists. Cf. Matt. xxiv. 15, τόπος ἅγιος. Apoc. xi. 2; xxi. 2 (ἡ πόλις ἡ ἁγία); xxi. 10.

5. ἡ συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος, the consummation of the age ("the end of the world"). Matt. xiii. 39 (συντ. αἰ.), 40, 49; xxiv. 3; xxviii. 20. Hebr. ix. 26, συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων, the meeting of the Old and New. Cf. Job xxvi. 10, LXX. ap. Schleusn.

6. ἵνα (ὅπως) πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθέν, eight times in St. Matthew. Not elsewhere in this form. In St. John, ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος (ἡ γραφή); in St. Mark once, ἵνα πλ. αἱ γραφαί.

7. τὸ ῥηθέν twelve times (ὁ ῥηθείς, iii. 3); ἐῤῥήθη six times. Not elsewhere of Scripture (Mark xiii. 14, a false reading). Cf. Gal. iii. 16. St. Matthew *always* uses τὸ ῥηθὲν when quoting Scripture himself. In other quotations he has γέγραπται, as the other Evangelists. He never uses the singular γραφή.

8. καὶ ἰδού (in narrative) in St. Matthew twenty-three times; in St. Luke sixteen; not in St. Mark.

9. (παρεγένοντο) . . . λέγοντες absolutely, without the dative of person. Cf. Gersdorf, *Beiträge*, 95 f.

10. ἐθνικός, Matt. v. 47; vi. 7; xviii. 17. Cf. Gal. ii. 14.

11. ὀμνύειν ἐν. twelve times in St. Matthew. Cf. Apoc. x. 6.

Several other peculiarities collected by Credner (*Einl.* 37) and Gersdorf establish the unity of authorship, but do not appear to be obviously characteristic of the position of the author, *e. g.*, ἕως οὗ, πᾶς ὅστις, τάφος, ἀναχωρεῖν, προσελθεῖν, μαθητεύειν, μαλακία, ἐγείρεσθαι ἀπό, the position of the adverb after the verb, etc. Cf. p. 351, n. 4.

Still more characteristic is the introduction of prophetic passages by the Evangelist himself (cf. p. 232, n. 1): i. 23 ‖ Is. vii. 14; ii. 15 ‖ Hos. xi. 1; ii. 18 ‖ Jer. xxxviii. 15; ii. 22; *iv.* 15, 16 ‖ *Is. ix.* 1, 2; *viii.* 17 ‖ *Is. liii.* 4; *xii.* 18 *ff.* ‖ *Is. xlii.* 1 *ff.*; *xiii.* 35 ‖ *Ps. lxxvii.* 2; xxi. 5 ‖ Zech. ix. 9; xxvii. 9, 10 ‖ Zech. xi. 13. The general references to Messiah's work (distinguished by italics) deserve especial notice.

than that in the other Synoptic Gospels,[1] while he relates only four parables.[2] Like St. Peter,[3] he is contented to lay the foundation of the Christian faith, and leave the superstructure to others. It is enough that Christ should be presented in the most vivid light, unfolding the truth in acts rather than in words; for faith will translate the passing deed into an abiding lesson. Everything centres in the immediate facts to be noticed. Without drawing a complete history, St. Mark frames a series of perfect pictures. But each is the representation of the outward fea-

1 The Miracles recorded by St. Mark fall into the following groups: —

1. Signs of the Saviour's Work (i. 23—ii. 12).
   - The devil cast out in the synagogue (i. 23—28.)
   - The fever healed in the house (i. 30, 31).
   - The leper cleansed (i. 40—45).
   - The paralytic pardoned and restored (ii. 3—12).
2. Signs of the Saviour's Teaching (iii. 1—6; iv. 35—v).
   - (*a*) Freedom of action.
     - The withered hand restored on the Sabbath (iii. 1—6).
   - (*b*) Trials of faith.
     - The storm stilled (iv. 35—41).
     - The legion cast out (v. 1—20).
     - The woman with issue healed (v. 25—34).
     - Jairus' daughter raised (v. 21—24, 35—43).
3. Signs of the Kingdom (vi. 30—52; vii. 24—viii. 9, etc.).
   - (*a*) The extent of the Kingdom.
     - The satisfaction of the Jews: five thousand fed (vi. 30—44).
     - The passage (vi. 45—52).
     - The satisfaction of Gentiles:
       - The Syrophenician (vii. 24—30).
       - *The deaf and dumb man* (vii. 31—37).
       - The four thousand fed (viii. 1—9).
   - (*b*) Special lessons.
     - Discernment. *The blind man at Bethsaida* (viii. 22—26).
     - Faith. The lunatic (ix. 14—29).
     - Mercy. Bartimæus (x. 46—52).
     - Judgment. The fig-tree (xi. 12—14).

The most remarkable omission is that of the "Centurion's servant." The Miracles peculiar to St. Mark are distinguished by italics.

2 They are the following: —

- (*a*) Parables of the growth of the Kingdom.
  - The sower (iv. 1—20). *The seed growing secretly* (iv. 26—29).
  - The mustard seed (iv. 30—32).
- (*b*) Parable of judgment.
  - The husbandmen (xii. 1—12).

3 Dr. Stanley's *Sermons on the Apostolic Age*, p. 102.

tures of the scene. For this reason the Evangelist avoids all reference to the Old Testament.[1] The quotations which occur in the Lord's discourses remain, but after the introduction he adds none in his own person. The living portraiture of Christ is offered in the clearness of His present energy, not as the fulfilment of the past, nor even as the foundation of the future. His acts prove that He is both; but this is a deduction from the narrative, and not the subject of it.

The characteristics of St. Mark to be sought in details.

It follows from what has been already said, that the chief point for study in St. Mark's Gospel is the vividness of its details, and not the subordination of its parts to the working out of any one idea. The narrative does not, indeed, vary considerably in its contents from the other Synoptic Gospels, and offers several broad divisions which mark successive stages in the work of Christ.[2] But turning from the construction

1 The quotation in xv. 28 is an interpolation. The quotation in i. 2, 3 seems to show that the Evangelist purposely avoided references to the prophecies afterwards. It may be noticed that the word *νόμος* never occurs in St. Mark; it is frequent in the other Evangelists, but is not found in St. Peter.

2 The following outline will convey a general notion of the construction of the Gospel, and supersede the necessity of examining it in detail:—

THE PREPARATION. i. 1—13.

1. THE WORK FORESHOWN BY ACTS. i. 14—ii. 12.
   (*a*) The call (i. 14—20).
   (*b*) Signs (i. 21—ii. 12).
   Possession; fever; leprosy; palsy.

2. OUTLINES OF TEACHING. ii. 13—iv. 34.
   (*a*) Traits of the new life.
   The call of the publican (ii. 13—17).
   The lesson of prudence (18—22).
   The Sabbath: Example (ii. 23—28); sign (iii. 1—6).
   (*b*) The Kingdom of God and the world.
   The apostles (iii. 13—19); the enemies (20—30); the true kindred (31—35).
   Parables of the Kingdom (iv. 1—34).
   (*c*) Signs (iv. 35—v.).
   The storm (iv. 35—41); legion (v. 1—20); the woman with issue; Jairus' daughter (21—43).
   (*d*) The issue: Unbelief (vi. 1—6).

of the whole record to the characteristic treatment of separate incidents, we are at once struck by the extent and importance of the minute peculiarities which St. Mark presents. There is not, perhaps, one narrative which he gives in common with St. Matthew and St. Luke to which he does not contribute some special feature. These peculiarities are so numerous that they prove his independence beyond all doubt, unless we are prepared to admit the only possible alternative, that they are due to the mere fancy of the Evangelist; a supposition which is sufficiently refuted by their character. The details point clearly to the impression produced upon an eye-witness, and are not such as would suggest themselves to the imagination of a

3. The Foundations of the Kingdom. vi. 6 *b*—xiii.
   (*a*) The mission of the Apostles (vi. 6 *b*—13).
      Temporal dominion.
         The feast of Herod: John (vi. 14—29).
         The feast of Christ: Christ on the waters (30—52).
      Hierarchical dominion.
         The tradition of the Elders (vii. 1—23); blessings for the Gentiles; the Syrophenician; the deaf and dumb; the multitudes fed (vii. 24—viii. 9).
         Lack of discernment in some (10—21).
            A sign (22—26).
         Revelation to others (27—33).
   (*b*) Glimpses of the Kingdom (ix.—x. 31).
      The prospect of suffering (viii. 34—38); the vision of glory (ix. 1—13); the secret source of strength (14—29).
      The citizens.
         Humility; charity; self-denial (ix. 33—50); marriage; children; riches; sacrifice (x. 1—31).
   (*c*) The sovereignty claimed (x. 32—xiii).
      The journey (x. 32—52).
      The triumphal entrance (xi. 1—11).
      The conflict.
         The sign (xi. 12—25); the first question (27—33); the portraiture (xii. 1—12); the temptation (13—34); the last question (35—37).
         The Pharisees (38—40): the widow (41—44).
         The judgment (xiii).
4. The Eternal Kingdom Entered through the Gate of Death. xiv.—xvi.
      The end foreshown by act (xiv. 3—9) and word (12—31).
      The agony; betrayal; denial; condemnation (xiv. 32—xv. 20).
      The crucifixion; burial (xv. 21—47).
      The resurrection; revelation; ascension (xvi).

chronicler. At one time we find a minute touch which places the whole scene before us;[1] at another time an accessory circumstance, such as often fixes itself on the mind, without appearing at first sight to possess any special interest;[2] now there is a phrase which reveals the feeling of those who were witnesses of some mighty work;[3] now a word which preserves some trait of the Saviour's tenderness,[4] or some expressive turn of His language.[5] Other additions are such as might have been made for the sake of clearness, even by one who had no immediate information as to the

Additions which prove direct information.

1 In the enumeration of the chief peculiarities of St. Mark given in the following notes, I have not attempted more than a rough classification. The erroneous views commonly held as to the epitomatory character of his Gospel invest these details with peculiar interest, and they will repay careful study.

iv. 37, 38, τὰ κύματα ἐπέβαλλεν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον . . . καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἐν τῇ πρύμνῃ ἐπὶ τὸ προσκεφάλαιον καθεύδων.

vi. 38.

vi. 48, καὶ ἤθελεν παρελθεῖν αὐτούς.

ix. 3.

ix. 14—16.

x. 50, ὁ δὲ ἀποβαλὼν τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ ἀναπηδήσας ἦλθεν . . .

xv. 44.

2 i. 20, μετὰ τῶν μισθωτῶν.

iv. 36, καὶ ἄλλα δὲ πλοῖα ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ.

vi. 41, καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἐμέρισεν πᾶσιν.

xiv. 51, 52. Cf. pp. 236, 323.

xiv. 3, συντρίψασα τὴν ἀλάβαστρον.

3 vi. 52, οὐ γὰρ συνῆκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις· ἦν γὰρ αὐτῶν ἡ καρδία πεπωρωμένη.

viii. 32, παρρησίᾳ τὸν λόγον ἐλάλει.

ix. 10.

x. 24, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ.

x. 32, ἦν προάγων αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο, οἱ δὲ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἐφοβοῦντο.

xi. 10, Εὐλογημένη ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυείδ.

Cf. vi. 3, ὁ τέκτων.

4 vi. 31, Δεῦτε ὑμεῖς αὐτοὶ κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς ἔρημον τόπον καὶ ἀναπαύσασθε ὀλίγον.

vi. 34, ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτούς ὅτι ἦσαν ὡς πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα.

viii. 3, καί τινες αὐτῶν ἀπὸ μακρόθεν εἰσίν.

ix. 21, 25, 27.

x. 3, 4.

5 i. 15, πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρός . . . πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ.

iv. 11, ἐκείνοις τοῖς ἔξω.

vii. 8, ἀφέντες τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

viii. 38, ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ τῇ μοιχαλίδι καὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ.

ix. 12, καὶ πῶς — ἐξουδενωθῇ;

ix. 39, οὐδεὶς γάρ . . . . δυνήσεται ταχὺ κακολογῆσαί με.

x. 21, ἄρας τὸν σταυρόν.

x. 30.

xi. 17, οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

xi. 24, πιστεύετε ὅτι ἐλάβετε καὶ ἔσται ὑμῖν.

xii. 6, ἔτι ἕνα εἶχεν υἱὸν ἀγαπητόν.

xiii. 32, οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός.

xiv. 18, ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ.

xiv. 37, Σίμων καθεύδεις;

events recorded;[1] but, on the other hand, there are some which indicate yet more distinctly the apostolic source of the peculiarities of St. Mark. He alone describes on several occasions the look and feeling of the Lord,[2] and preserves the very Aramaic words which He uttered.[3] He records minute particulars of persons, number, time, and place,[4] which are unnoticed by the other Evangelists.

1 iii. 14, *ἵνα ὦσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺ κηρύσσειν . . .*
iii. 30, *ὅτι ἔλεγον, Πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει.*
v. 26, *μηδὲν ὠφεληθεῖσα ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ χεῖρον ἐλθοῦσα.*
v. 20.
vii. 2—4.
xi. 13, *ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν σύκων.*
Cf. vi. 13, *ἤλειφον ἐλαίῳ πολλοὺς ἀῤῥώστους.* v. 4, 5.

2 iii. 5, [*καὶ περιβλεψάμενος αὐτοὺς*] *μετ' ὀργῆς, συλλυπούμενος ἐπὶ τῇ πωρώσει τῆς καρδίας λέγει . . .*
iii. 34, *περιβλεψάμενος κύκλῳ τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν καθημένους λέγει . . .*
v. 32, *περιεβλέπετο* (*not* aor.) *ἰδεῖν τὴν τοῦτο ποιήσασαν.*
vi. 6, *ἐθαύμαζε διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν.*
x. 21, *ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ ἠγάπησεν αὐτόν . . .*
x. 23, *καὶ περιβλεψάμενος ὁ Ἰησοῦς . . .*
xi. 11, *καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντα . . .*
Cf. i. 41, 43; (x. 22).

3 iii. 17, *Βοανηργές, ὅ ἐστιν υἱοὶ βροντῆς.*
v. 41, *Ταλιθὰ κοῦμι, ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον, Τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε.*
vii. 11, *Κορβᾶν, ὅ ἐστιν δῶρον.* (Cf. Matt. xxvii. 6).
vii. 34, *Ἐφφαθά, ὅ ἐστιν Διανοίχθητι.*
xiv. 36, *Ἀββᾶ, ὁ πατήρ.*
Cf. ix. 43; x. 46.

4 (*a*) Persons: i. 29, *καὶ Ἀνδ. μ. Ἰ. καὶ Ἰ.*
i. 36, *κατεδίωξαν αὐτὸν Σίμων καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ.*
ii. 26.
iii. 6, *μετὰ τῶν Ἡρωδιανῶν.*
iii. 22, *οἱ γραμματεῖς οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καταβάντες . . .*
vii. 26.
xi. 11, *μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα.*
xi. 21, *ἀναμνησθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος.*
xiii. 3, *ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν κατ' ἰδίαν Πέτρος καὶ Ἰ. καὶ Ἰ. καὶ Ἀ.*
xiv. 65, *οἱ ὑπηρέται.*
xv. 7.
xv. 21, *τὸν πατέρα Ἀ. καὶ Ῥ.*
xvi. 7, *τῷ Πέτρῳ.*
(*b*) Number: v. 13, *ὡς δισχίλιοι.*
vi. 7, *ἀποστέλλειν δύο δύο.*
vi. 40, *ἀνέπεσαν πρασιαὶ πρασιαί, κατὰ ἑκατὸν καὶ κατὰ πεντήκοντα.*
xiv. 30, *πρὶν ἢ δὶς ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ.*
(*c*) Time: i. 35, *πρωῒ ἔννυχα λίαν.* Cf. xvi. 2.
ii. 1, *δι' ἡμερῶν.*
iv. 35, *ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὀψίας γενομένης.*
vi. 2, *γενομένου σαββάτου.*
xi. 11, *ὀψίας ἤδη οὔσης.* Cf. xi. 19.
xiv. 68.
xv. 25, *ἦν δὲ ὥρα τρίτη.*
(*d*) Place: ii. 13, *παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν.* Cf. iii. 7; iv. 1; v. 21.
v. 20, *ἐν τῇ Δεκαπόλει.*
vii. 31, *ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὁρίων Δεκαπόλεως.*
(viii. 10).
xii. 41, *κατέναντι τοῦ γαζοφυλακίου.*
xiii. 3, *κατέναντι τοῦ ἱεροῦ.*
xiv. 68, *εἰς τὸ προαύλιον.*
xv. 39, *ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἐξ ἐναντίας.*
xvi. 5, *καθ. ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς.*

His language and style correspond with this particularity of observation. His phrases of transition are lively.[1] In narration he frequently adopts the present for the historic tenses,[2] and introduces a direct for an indirect form of expression.[3] He couples together words or phrases of similar meaning to heighten or define his meaning.[4] Like St. John, he repeats the subject in place of using the relative.[5] And in many cases he uses terms of singular force which do not occur elsewhere in the New Testament.[6]

Style.

The few incidents which are peculiar to St. Mark illustrate, as might be expected, the general character of his Gospel. The one parable[a] which he alone has preserved turns our attention to God's presence in the slow and silent operations of nature, as typical of His constant presence among men in their daily life. Of the two peculiar miracles,[b] one lays open the gradual process of the cure wrought;[7] and the other exhibits a trait which seems to reveal something of the agony of the Redeemer's work, as leading to the last agony at Gethsemane, when He *looked up to heaven and groaned* (ἐστέναξε) in contemplation of the wreck which sin had wrought in man, who is ever dull in hearing and slow in praising God.[8] The connection of these three

Additional incidents characteristic.

Mark iv. 26—29.

1 Thus καὶ εὐθύς occurs, perhaps, twenty-seven times (the reading is often uncertain) in St. Mark, eight times in St. Matthew, and twice in St. Luke.

2 i. 40, 44; ii. 3 ff.; xi. 1 ff.; xiv. 43, 66, etc.

3 iv. 39, Σιώπα, πεφίμωσο.

v. 8, Ἐξελθε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

vi. 23, 31; xii. 6, etc.

4 i. 13, ἦν [ἐκεῖ] ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.

ii. 20, τότε . . . ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ.

iii. 29, οὐκ ἄφεσιν ἔχει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἀλλὰ ἔνοχός ἐστιν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος.

iv. 33, 34; v. 26, etc.

vi. 25, εὐθὺς μετὰ σπουδῆς.

vii. 21, ἔσωθεν . . . ἐκ τῆς καρδίας, etc.

5 ii. 19, 20, 27; iii. 1, 3; iv. 15 (cf. Mt. and Lc.); v. 41, 42; vi. 17, 18 (cf. Mt.); x. 13 (cf. Mt. and Lc.); xiv. 66, 67 (cf. Mt. and Lc.).

6 ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι, ix. 15; xiv. 33; xvi. 5, 6.

ἐναγκαλίζεσθαι, ix. 36; x. 16.

προμεριμνᾶν, xiii. 11.

συνθλίβειν, v. 24, 31.

7 viii 22—26, ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας . . . εἶτα πάλιν ἐπέθηκεν τὰς χεῖρας.

8 vii. 31—37. Cf. John xi. 35. It is remarkable that in both these miracles our Lord took the sufferer apart (vii. 33,

a See note, additional, p. 472.

b See note, additional, p. 472.

special lessons is surely most significant. Without taking away the attention from the outward act, they lead us to look at the inmost processes which the outward act reveals. Together they give hope and strength for all labor. A Saviour sorrows over man's sufferings and unbelief, and meets each advance of faith; a Spirit works within us, bringing to maturity by hidden steps the seed which God has planted.

Additional traits in common incidents.

The smaller variations in the narrative offer several features of interest, in addition to those which have been already noticed. One of these characterizes the whole Gospel. St. Mark, more than any other Evangelist, records the effect which was produced on others by the Lord's working. Just as he follows out the details of the acts themselves, he mentions the immediate and wider results which they produced. From the beginning to the end he tells us of the wonder and amazement and fear[1] with which men listened to the teaching of Christ. Everywhere multitudes crowd to hear Him,[2] as well as to receive His blessings. When He was in a house, *the whole city was gathered to the door*, and even then the crowd could find no room. So great at times was the excitement that He *could no longer openly enter into the city;* and it is said twice that, *as many came and went*, He *could not even eat*,[3] so that He seemed

Mark i. 33.
Mark ii. 2.
Mark i. 45.

ἀπολαβόμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου; viii. 23, ἐξήνεγκεν ἔξω τῆς κώμης).

One other circumstance in connection with Christ's miracles is noticed by St. Mark, that even those who "touched the border of His garment were made whole" (Mark vi. 56. Cf. Luke vi. 19; viii. 46; Acts xix. 12).

1 i. 22 (ἐξεπλήσσοντο), 27; vi. 20; xi. 18; vii. 37 (ὑπερπερισσῶς ἐξεπλ.); x. 26 (περισσῶς ἐξεπλ.).

v. 20 (ἐθαύμαζον); ix. 15 (ἐξεθαμβήθησαν); x. 24 (ἐθαμβοῦντο).

v. 42 (ἐξέστησαν ἐκστάσει μεγάλῃ); vi. 51 (λίαν ἐκ περισσοῦ ἐξίσταντο).

iv. 41 (ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν); v. 15; (ix. 6); ix. 32.

2 ii. 13, πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἤρχετο πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς (cf. ii. 14, 15); iv. 1, ὄχλος πλεῖστος; v. 21, 24, 34; x. 1; xii. 37.

3 iii. 20, 21, ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς μηδὲ ἄρτον φαγεῖν· καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ . . . ἔλεγον ὅτι ἐξέστη. vi. 31, ἦσαν οἱ ἐρχόμενοι καὶ οἱ ὑπάγοντες πολλοί, καὶ οὐδὲ φαγεῖν εὐκαίρουν.

to His kindred *to be beside Himself.* Those who were healed, in spite of His injunctions, proclaimed abroad the tidings of His power.[1] And in His retirement, men *from all the cities ran together on foot* to see Him; and *wherever He went, into villages or cities or country, they placed their sick* before Him; and *as many as touched Him were made whole.*

Mark vi. 33.
Mark vi. 55, 56.

In substance and style and treatment the Gospel of St. Mark is essentially a transcript from life.[2] The course and the issue of facts are imaged in it with the clearest outline. If all other arguments against the mythic origin of the Evangelic narratives were wanting, this vivid and simple record, stamped with the most distinct impress of independence and originality, — totally unconnected with the symbolism of the Old Dispensation, totally independent of the deeper reasonings of the New, — would be sufficient to refute a theory subversive of all faith in history. The details which were originally addressed to the vigorous intelligence of Roman hearers[3] are still pregnant with instruction for us. The teaching which "met their wants" in the first age finds a corresponding field for its action now. It would be worse than idle to attempt any general comparison of the effects which the several Gospels may be supposed to work upon

The importance of St. Mark as a historical record.

1 i. 28, 45, ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν πολλὰ καὶ διαφημίζειν τὸν λόγον. v. 20; vii. 36.

2 The following passages may be taken as examples of St. Mark's style in connection with the parallel accounts: vi. 30—43 (The feeding the five thousand); ix. 14—29 (The healing of the lunatic); and vi. 14—29 (The feast of Herod). In each case we have, I believe, the testimony of an eye-witness. In the last some friend of John may have been present.

3 Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39. Cf. pp. 191, 237. One peculiarity of St. Mark's language not yet noticed seems to point to this Roman origin, his use of several Latin forms which do not occur in the other Gospels: κεντυρίων, xv. 39, 44, 45 (elsewhere ἑκατόνταρχος, -άρχης); κοδράντης, xii. 42 (Matt. v. 26); σπεκουλάτωρ (vi. 27); τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι (xv. 15. Cf. Acts xvii. 9). To these may perhaps be added ξέστης (vii. 4, 8); κράββατος (in St. John and Acts). Other words he has in common with one or more of the other Evangelists: δηνάριον (all); κῆνσος (Mt.); λεγίων (Mt. Lc.); πραιτώριον (Mt. J.); φραγελλοῦν (Mt.).

In all these notices of St. Mark's language I have derived great help from Credner (*Einl.* § 49), though his large collections require careful sifting.

the Church, but it is impossible not to see some significance in the circumstance that the historic worth of the Gospels was then most recklessly assailed when St. Mark was regarded as a mere epitomator of the other Synoptists. We cannot gain a full perception of the truth till the form of its outward revelation is surely realized. The form is not all, but it is an element in the whole. The picture of the sovereign power of Christ battling with evil among men swayed to and fro by tumultuous passions, is still needful, though we may turn to St. Matthew and St. John for the ancient types or deeper mysteries of Christianity, or find in St. Luke its inmost connection with the unchanging heart of man.

III. St. Luke. *Christ the Saviour.*

For "the Gospel of St. Paul"[1] is in its essential characteristics the complementary history to that of St. Matthew. The difference between the two may be seen in their opening chapters. The first words of the Hebrew Evangelist gave the clew to

[1] The following outline of the Gospel will serve to explain the connection of the several parts: —

INTRODUCTION. i. ii.
The annunciation of the birth of John and of Christ (i. 1—56).
The birth of John; the nativity; the presentation; Christ with the doctors (i. 57—ii).

1. THE PREPARATION. iii.—iv. 13.
The work of the Baptist (iii. 1—20).
The attestation at the baptism and by descent (21—38).
The trial (iv. 1—13).

2. THE ANNOUNCEMENT. iv. 14—44.
Preaching (14, 15).
Tidings at Nazareth (16—30).
Signs: The unclean spirit (31—37); Simon's wife's mother (38, 39). Many works (40, 41); wide teaching (42—44).

3. THE FUTURE CHURCH. v.—ix. 43 *a*.
(*a*) Its universality.
The sign: the draught of fishes (v. 1—11).
The leper cleansed (12—16).
The paralytic restored (17—26).
The publican called (27—39).
The law vindicated from superstition (vi. 1—11).
(*b*) Its constitution.
The apostles called: the Sermon on the mount (vi. 12—49).
The spring of help.

his whole narrative; and so the first chapter of St. Luke, with its declarations of the blessedness of faith and the exaltation of the lowly, lead at once to the point from which he contemplated the life

Luke i. 45, 52.

Faith in man: the centurion's servant (vii. 2—10).
Love in Christ: the widow's son (11—17).
The hearers.
John and the people (18—35).
The Pharisee and the sinner (36—50).
The ministering women (viii. 1—3).

(*c*) Its development.
The sower (viii. 4—18).
Earthly ties (19—21).
Lessons of faith: the storm stilled (22—25); the legion cast out (26—39); the woman healed (43—48); Jairus' daughter raised (40—56).

(*d*) Its claims.
The commission (ix. 1—6); the earthly king (7—9).
The five thousand fed (9—17); the confession (18—28).
The transfiguration; the lunatic healed (28—43 *a*).

4. The Universal Church. The Rejection of the Jews Foreshown. ix. 43 *b*—xviii. 30.

(*a*) Preparation (ix. 43 *b*—xi. 13).
Coming persecution (43 *b*—45). Traits of the true disciple (46—62).
The mission of the seventy (x. 1—20). Thanksgiving (21—24).
One family of men: the good Samaritan (25—37).
One thing needful: Mary and Martha (38—42).
Prayer the strength of life (xi. 1—13).

(*b*) Lessons of warning (xi. 14—xiii. 9).
Inward: Seven worse spirits (xi. 14—28).
Sign of Jonah (29—36).
Pharisaic religion (37—54).
Outward: Persecution (xii. 1—12).
Wealth (13—31).
Life (32—53).
Signs of the times (54—59).
The fate of the Galilæans (xiii. 1—5).
The barren fig-tree (6—9).

(*c*) Lessons of progress (xiii. 10—xiv. 24).
The woman (the Church) set free (xiii. 10—17).
The growth of the Church outward and inward (18—21).
The duty of effort (22—30).
The assurance in working (31—35).
Formalism defeated (xiv. 1—6).
The poor called (7—14).
The feast furnished with guests (15—24).

(*d*) Lessons of discipleship.
The completeness of the sacrifice (xiv. 25—35).
The universality of the offer (xv.).
Social duties.

of Him who was *to give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death.* The perfect manhood of the Saviour, and the consequent mercy and universality of His covenant, is his central subject, rather than the temporal relations or eternal basis of Christianity. In the other Gospels we find our King, our Lord, our God; but in St. Luke we see the image of our Great High Priest, *made perfect through suffering, tempted in all points as we are, but without sin*, so that each trait of human feeling and natural love helps us to complete the outline and confirms its truthfulness.

Luke i. 79.

Hebr. ii. 10; *iv.* 15.

The pictures of the Infancy, to which the Temple forms the background, typify in a remarkable manner this human and priestly aspect of the life of Christ. The circumstances and the place equally turn the thoughts of the reader to the realities shadowed forth in the old law of sacrifice. The

1. *The record of the* Infancy. *Luke ii.* 21, 22, 24.

The stewardship of wealth (xvi.).
Offences; faith; service (xvii. 1—10).
(*e*) The coming end (xvii. 11—xviii. 30).
The sign: the ten lepers (xvii. 11—19).
The unexpectedness of Christ coming (20—37).
The unjust judge (xviii. 1—8).
Obstacles to faith.
Self-righteousness; pride; selfishness (9—30).
5. The Sovereignty Claimed. xviii. 31—xxi.
(*a*) The journey.
Warnings; Bartimæus; Zacchæus; the talents (xviii. 31—xix. 27).
(*b*) The entry (xix. 28—44).
The work begun (45—48).
(*c*) The conflict. The first question (xx. 1—8); the portraiture (9—19); the Temptation (20—40); the last question (41—44).
The Pharisees (45, 46); the widow (xxi. 1—4).
The judgment (xxi. 5—36).
The work (37, 38).
6. The Sovereignty Gained by Death. xxii.—xxiv.
The end foreshown (xxii. 1—23).
Divisions within (24—34); dangers without (35—38).
The agony; betrayal; denial; condemnation (39—71).
The judgment of Herod and Pilate (xxiii. 1—25).
The crucifixion; burial (26—56).
The revelation of the risen Saviour (xxiv. 1—43).
The last charge; the ascension (44—53).

Saviour Himself — the perfect victim and the perfect Priest — received the seal of the first Covenant, and in due time was presented in the Temple and redeemed from its service. The offering was the offering of the poor; and the first blessing was mingled with words of sorrow. Years of silent growth then followed; and when He had arrived at the age of legal maturity[1] "the child Jesus" went up to the feast, and claimed the Temple as His Father's House, and spoke of other work than that in which His life as yet was spent. But while the future was thus mysteriously foreshown, for the present He *was subject* to His earthly parents, *and increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men.* The development of the divine consciousness in Him who was indeed God is described to us as it proceeded according to the laws of human life. At each successive stage in the long preparation for His work, from first to last, we mark the gradual and harmonious revelation of His double nature. His Godhead and Manhood — signs of triumph and suffering — are united at the Nativity, the Presentation, the Examination in the Temple, the Baptism, the Temptation; for all is order and truth in the Godlike life, quickening and quickened in due measure.[2]

Luke ii. 34, 35.

Luke ii. 40.

Luke ii. 41 ff.

Luke ii. 52.

The main contents of St. Luke's Gospel may be divided into several groups which present distinctive features, though each one passes so gradually into the next as to afford no clear line of demarcation. A general announcement of Christ's work forms an introduction to the more detailed narrative.

2. The announcement of Christ's work. (iv. 14—44.)

1 *Chagiga* (ap. Wetst. *ad Luc.* ii. 42): A xii. anno filius censetur maturus. *Joma.* (*id.*): Ab anno xii. initiabant pueros ad jejunandum. Tradition assigned this age as the crisis in the lives of Moses, Samuel, and Solomon (Wetst. *l. c.*). Cf. [Hipp.] *adv. Hær.* p. 156.

2 Origen, *Hom.* iv. *in Luc.* Non illo tantum tempore præparatæ sunt viæ et directæ semitæ, sed usque hodie adventum Domini Salvatoris spiritus Joannis virtusque præcedit. O magna mysteria Domini et dispensationis ejus! Angeli præcurrunt Jesum: angeli quotidie aut ascendunt aut descendunt super salutem hominum in Christo Jesu. Cf. John i. 51.

This announcement differs characteristically from that in St. Matthew. In St. Matthew the preaching of the Lord is connected with the fulfilment of prophecy; in St. Luke it is presented in its own power. In St. Matthew the first discourse is the Sermon on the Mount, in which Christianity is displayed in its relation to Judaism; in St. Luke, the discourse at Nazareth, in which the Gospel is freely offered to the poor, the desolate, and the stranger. The first miracles in St. Matthew signify the removal of legal impurity and national distinctions; while in St. Luke the message of mercy is confirmed by the deliverance of captives from spiritual and bodily infirmity, from evil active and personal[1] within them.

Matt. iv. 14 *ff.*
Luke iv. 15.
Luke iv. 16 *ff.*
Matt. viii. 1, 5.
Luke iv. 31, 38.

In the succeeding chapters the work thus outlined is described under two great heads. The first (v.—ix. 43 a) contains a view of the future Church; the second the teaching of Christ, leading to the call of a new people and the rejection of the Jews. The first is chiefly a record of miracles;[2] the

Two great divisions of the Gospel.

1 Luke iv. 35, 39 (ἐπετίμησεν). The word occurs of the *fever* in St. Luke only. Cf. viii. 24 and parallels.

These two miracles were wrought on the Sabbath (iv. 16); and hence we may see that spiritual and bodily maladies are so far healed by Christ as they interfere with religious life. In character the two miracles are complementary: there was an unclean spirit in the synagogue, and a faithful woman *suffering* (ἦν συνεχομένη) *at home from a great fever.*

2 The spiritual teaching of the miracles in St. Luke, as a whole, will be seen from the following table. The miracles peculiar to St. Luke are marked by Italics:—

1. Signs of the Mission of the Saviour (iv. 18)—generally to check the action of evil.
   (*a*) Spiritual.
      The unclean spirit cast out (iv. 33—37).
   (*b*) Physical.
      Peter's wife's mother healed (iv. 38, 39).
2. The Christian Society.
   (*a*) Its universality: *The miraculous draught of fishes* (v. 4—11).
      Hence Christ
      a. Purifies the outward life.
         The leper cleansed (v. 12—14).

second a record of parables.[1] In the one we read the works of the Son of God; in the other the words of the

b. Purifies the inward life.
The palsy healed (v. 18—26).
c. Quickens deadened energies.
The withered hand restored (vi. 6—11).
(*b*) The spring of its blessings.
a. Faith in man.
The centurion's servant (vii. 2—10).
b. Love in Christ.
The widow's son raised (vii. 11—17).
(*c*) The fulness of Christ's power to preserve it, as seen in His sovereignty over
a. Matter.
The storm stilled (viii. 22—25).
b. Spirit.
The Gadarene demoniacs (viii. 26—39).
c. Death.
Typical: the woman with issue (viii. 43—48).
Natural: Jairus' daughter raised (viii. 41—56).
(*d*) The extent of its claims.
a. To instruct and strengthen all.
The five thousand fed (ix. 10—17).
b. To overcome by faith all evil.
The lunatic healed (ix. 37—42).

3. Signs of Christ's Working on Men.
(*a*) To give utterance to the spiritually dumb.
The dumb devil cast out (xi. 14—26).
(*b*) To remove
a. The inward checks to our progress.
The woman with a spirit of infirmity (xiii. 11—17).
b. The outward obstacles to it (*v.* 5).
The man with the dropsy (xiv. 1—6).
(*c*) To cleanse impurity, outward and inward (*v.* 19).
The ten lepers cleansed (xvii. 12—19).
(*d*) To restore spiritual sight.
The blind man restored (xviii. 35—43).
[*The healing of Malchus:* xxii. 50, 51.]

The miracles recorded by St. Matthew and St. Mark which are omitted by St. Luke are: The walking on the sea; the healing of the Syrophœnician's daughter; the feeding of the four thousand; the barren fig-tree. The omission of the last three is the more worthy of notice because they symbolize the call of the Gentiles. But the character of St. Luke's Gospel is to be sought in its general tone. The message which it conveys is universal, and not exclusive in any sense.

1 The parables in St. Luke illustrate the general course of his narrative.

1. The Foundations.
(*a*) Love: *the two debtors* (vii. 41—43).
(*b*) Productiveness: the sower (viii. 4—15).
(*c*) Charity: *the good Samaritan* (x. 30—37).
(*d*) Importunity in prayer: *the friend at midnight* (xi. 5—8).

Son of Man. The miraculous draught of fishes, combined with the prayer of St. Peter and the promise of the Lord, is a perfect introduction to the doctrine of the Church. Its first characteristic is universality; and the idea which is thus announced is continuously unfolded in a series of acts in which Christ triumphs over physical uncleanness, moral guilt, social degradation, and legal superstition.

3. The future Church. Its universality. (Luke v. 1—vi. 11.)

Luke v. 8, 10.

Luke v. 12—16; 17—26; 27—39.

Luke vi. 1—11.

The extent of the new Covenant having been thus set forth, we next observe something of the nature of the society in which it is embodied. The selection and instruction of the Apostles marks them as men who do not take their stand on the

Its constitution. (Luke vi. 12—viii. 3.)

2. Lessons of Warning.
   - (*a*) Dependence: *the rich fool* (xii. 16—21).
   - (*b*) Faithfulness: the servants (xii. 35—48).
   - (*c*) Fruitfulness: *the barren fig-tree* (xiii. 6—9).

3. Lessons of Progress.
   - (*a*) Outward growth: the mustard seed (xiii. 18, 19).
     Inward change: the leaven (xiii. 20, 21).
   - (*b*) The humble exalted: *the chief seats* (xiv. 7—11).
     The poor called: *the great supper* (xiv. 12—24).

4. Lessons of Discipleship.
   - (*a*) The rational sacrifice.
     The tower-builder (xiv. 28—30).
     The king going to war (xiv. 31—33).
   - (*b*) The universal offer.
     The guideless wanderer from the Church: the lost sheep (xv. 3—7).
     The lost slumberer in the Church: *the lost drachma* (xv. 8—10).
     The wilful apostate from the Church: *the prodigal son* (xv. 11—32).
   - (*c*) Social duties.
     In the use of outward blessings.
     Prudence: *the unjust steward* (xvi. 1—12).
     Charity: *the rich man and Lazarus* (xvi. 19—31).
     Service no ground of merit: *unprofitable servants* (xvii. 7—10).

5. Lessons of Judgment.
   - (*a*) The injured heard at last: *the unjust judge* (xviii. 1—8).
   - (*b*) Man's judgment reversed: *the Pharisee and publican* (xviii. 9—14).
   - (*c*) The Christian rewarded according to his work: *the talents* (xix. 11—27).
   - (*d*) The retribution of the wicked: the wicked husbandmen (xx. 9—16).

fulfilment of the Law, but on the wider basis of Christian charity.[1] The events which follow illustrate the source of their power and the character of those among whom they have to work. Faith on the part of man, and love on the part of Christ, are shown to bring blessings beyond all hope. John and the people, the Pharisee and the sinner,[2] exhibit the contrasts of Jewish life. And the notice of the ministering women aptly closes the section which opens with the call of the Apostles. The Teacher, who included in His Church the humble, the distressed, and the repentant, is attended by the weak and loving rather than by a council of elders, a band of warriors, or a school of prophets.[3]

Luke vii. 2—10; 11—17.

Luke vii. 18—35; 36—50.

Luke viii. 1—3.

Such being the breadth and foundation of the Christian society, we are led to regard the process of its development, and the nature of the claims which it makes on those who are admitted to its privileges. The parable of the sower is presented under a new aspect in St. Luke; it exhibits the responsibility of the hearers of the Gospel,[4] and does not, as in St. Matthew, form an introduction to a general view of the outward kingdom. Hence, next we are taught the obligation of Christian example and the omnipotence of religious duty; and to

Its development. *(Luke viii.* 4—56.)

Luke viii. 16—18; 19—21.

1 This follows from a comparison of Luke vi. 20—49 with St. Matthew's record of the Sermon on the Mount. As to the identity of the two discourses see p. 351 n. 6.

2 The lesson of love is the first parable recorded by St. Luke, as the draught of fishes is the first miracle.

3 Evans, *Scripture Biography*, ii. p. 268. Exod. xviii. 25 (Moses); 2 Sam. xxiii. 8 ff. (David); 2 Kings ii. 2, 7 (Elijah). The apostles themselves offer a contrast scarcely less striking than the women.

4 This difference in the scope of the parable is indicated by *vv.* 8, 15, compared with Matt. xiii. 8—23. St. Luke dwells on the single idea of productiveness, and does not regard the different degrees of productiveness which must exist in the Christian church. This idea is afterwards given in *the pounds* (xix. 12 ff.); and conversely St. Matthew notices only equal productiveness in *the talents* (xxv. 14 ff.).

The comparison of Matt. xiii. 13 (ὅτι) with Luke viii. 10 (ἵνα) is full of instruction: spiritual deafness is at once the cause and the result of not listening to God's voice.

encourage men in the varied struggles of Christian life, a series of miracles attests the Saviour's power over matter, spirit, and death. He supplies the strength when He enjoins the task. When He sends forth His apostles He endues them with power. When they return, He feeds the hungry multitude, lest they should despair from the inadequacy of their natural powers for the conversion of the world. The prospect of suffering is relieved by the vision of glory; and when evil prevails against them, He still casts out the unclean spirit which baffles their doubting efforts.

Luke viii. 22—25; 26—39; 40—56.

Its claims. (ix. 1—43 a.)

Luke ix. 1—6; 10—17.

Luke ix. 28—36.

Luke ix. 37—43 a.

The second great division of the record of the Lord's ministry, includes a remarkable series of acts and discourses which are grouped together in connection with the last journey to Jerusalem.[1] Some of the incidents occur in different connections in the other Evangelists; and the whole section proves, by the absence of historical data

4. *The universal Teaching.*

The Great Episode.

(Luke ix. 43 b.—xviii. 30.)

[1] The connections of time in this great episode (ix. 43 *b*—xviii. 14) deserve particular attention, especially in reference to those sections which occur in the other Evangelists in a different context. These parallels for the most part consist in short and weighty sayings, such as are constantly repeated, even by writers in different works; and there is no difficulty in supposing that they were introduced by the Lord into different discourses. More rarely parables recur in new relations; and in one case incidents, alike in every particular, are found to occupy a different position in St. Luke from that which they occupy in St. Matthew. Besides these partial or complete parallels, there are a large number of sections peculiar to St. Luke. The following table of passages, with the particles of connection by which they are introduced, will place the question fairly before the reader:

I. Sections including parallels with the other Gospels.

(*a*) In short sayings or parts of discourses.

x. 1—16 (μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα). Cf. Matt. ix. 37, 38; x. 10—16; xi. 21—23; x. 40. Luke ix. 1 ff.

xi. 1—4 (καὶ ἐγεν. ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐ. ἐν τ. τ. προσ.). Cf. Matt. vi. 9—13.

xi. 5—13 (καὶ εἶπεν). Cf. Matt. vii. 7—11.

xi. 29—36 (τῶν δὲ ὄχλων ἐπαθροιζομένων). Cf. Matt. xii. 38—42; v. 15; vi. 22, 23. Luke viii. 16.

xi. 37—54 (ἐν δὲ τῷ λαλῆσαι). Cf. Matt. xxiii.

xii. 1—12 (ἐν οἷς). Cf. Matt. xvi. 6; x. 28—33, etc.

xii. 22—40 (εἶπεν δέ . . . Διὰ τοῦτο). Cf. Matt. vi.

xii. 41—53 (εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Πέτρος). Cf. Matt. xxiv. 45 ff.

xii. 54—59 (ἔλεγεν δέ). Cf. Matt. xvi. 2, 3, etc.

and the unity of its general import, that a moral and not a temporal sequence is the law of the Gospels. For it is possible to trace throughout this part of the narrative a contrast between the true and the false people of God, between the spiritual and the literal Israel.[1] The shadow of eclipse is seen to rest already on the old system and the old spirit. A new covenant and a new discipleship are ushered in by words of warning and reproof. The journey, which seemed to be for honor, is announced to be for death. The intolerant zeal of St. John is checked when he would have restrained

Preparation. Luke ix. 43 b—56.

xiii. 22—30 (εἶπεν δέ τις). Cf. Matt. vii. 13, etc.

xiii. 31—35 (ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ). Cf. Matt. xxiii. 37—39.

xiv. 25—35 (συνεπορεύοντο δὲ αὐτῷ ὀ. π.). Cf. Matt. x. 37, etc.

xvii. 1—4 (εἶπεν δέ). Cf. Matt. xviii. 6, 7; 21, 22.

xvii. 22—37 (εἶπεν δέ). Probably the same discourse as Matt. xxiv.

(*b*) In parables and longer discourses.

ix. 46 ff. (εἰσῆλθεν δέ) = Matt. xviii. 1 ff. ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ. Mark ix. 33 ff.

x. 21—24 (ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ) = Matt. xi. 25 (ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ).

xiii. 18—21 (ἔλεγεν οὖν). Matt. xiii. 31, 32. Mark iv. 30—32.

xiv. 16—24 (ὁ δὲ εἶπεν [ἑνὶ τῶν συνανακ.]). A variation recurs Matt. xxii. 1—14.

xv. 3—7 (εἶπεν δέ). Matt. xviii. 12—14.

(*c*) In incidents.

ix. 49 (δέ). Mark x. 38 (δέ).

ix. 57 (καὶ πορευομένων αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ). Matt. viii. 18.

xi. 14 (καὶ ἦν ἐκβ. δ.). Matt. xii. 22 (τότε).

xviii. 15—17 (προσέφερον δέ). Matt. xix. 13 (τότε): Mark x. 13 (καὶ προσ.).

II. Sections peculiar to St. Luke.

ix. 51—56 (ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ συμπληρ. τ. ἡμ. τ. ἀναλ. αὐ.).

x. 17—20 (ὑπέστρεψαν δέ).

x. 25—37 (καὶ ἰδού). Not the same as Matt. xxii. 34 ff.; Mark xii. 28 ff.

x. 38—42 (ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι).

xii. 13—21 (εἶπεν δὲ τις αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου).

xiii. 1—5 (παρῆσαν δέ τινες ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ).

xiii. 6—9 (ἔλεγεν δέ).

xiii. 10—17 (ἦν δὲ διδάσκων).

xiv. 1—13 (καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐλθεῖν εἰς οἶκον).

xv. 8—10; 11—32 (εἶπεν δέ).

xvi. 1—13 (ἔλεγεν δέ). Cf. Matt. vi. 24.

xvi. 14—31 (ἤκουον δὲ . . . καὶ εἶπεν). Cf. Matt. v. 18.

xvii. 5—10 (καὶ εἶπαν).

xvii. 11—19 (καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι αὐ. εἰς Ἰ.).

xviii. 1—8 (ἔλεγεν δέ).

xviii. 9—14 (εἶπεν δέ).

Of all these passages one only is attended with any serious difficulty — Luke ix. 57, compared with Matt. viii. 18. The historical order appears to be that given by St. Luke. In all the other cases of parallelism we find repetitions which are perfectly natural, and borne out by repetitions which occur in the same Gospel. It does not, however, appear that the difference between ἔλεγεν and εἶπεν as introductory words is so clear as to admit of being urged: xiv. 7, 12; xvi. 5; yet see iii. 7; iv. 22; v. 36, etc.

[1] This has been pointed out by Mr. Browne, *Ordo Sæclorum*, p. 638, n. 1.

the progress of good because it was advanced by one "who followed not with them." St. James and St. John are rebuked when they would call down fire on the enemies of Jerusalem, though the Son of Man came to save men's lives and not to destroy them. For the Christian there is no shelter, no delay, no retreat. After this introduction the fuller development of the new dispensation begins with the mission of the Seventy, and not with the mission of the Apostles. Its groundwork, from the point of sight of St. Luke, is the symbolic evangelization of every nation upon earth,[1] and not the restoration of the twelve tribes of Israel. The mission is closed by thanksgiving; and as a comment upon the tidings with which the teacher was charged, we read that the spirit of the Law was fulfilled by a Samaritan, that the truest devotion was shown by the patient listener who was not *cumbered with much serving*, that prayer, even if the answer be delayed, will in the end triumph over all difficulties. Then follow lessons of warning, of progress, of discipleship, of judgment. Perils from within and from without are laid open, perils from the lack of God's Spirit, from wonder-seeking and Pharisaism, from persecution and worldly cares. The times are shown to be pregnant with signs of ruin; and yet, in the midst of this stern teaching, the "multitude rejoices." In spite of opposition the growth of the Church is assured. If some are rejected, others from afar shall fill their places.

Luke ix. 57—62.

Luke x. 1—16.

Luke x. 21—24.

Luke x. 30—37.

Luke x. 32—42.
Luke xi. 1—13.
Lessons of warning.
Luke xi. 14—28.
Luke xi. 29—36; 37—54.
Luke xii. 1—12; 13—53.
Luke xii. 54.
Luke xiii. 9.
Luke xiii. 17.
Luke xiii. 18—30.
Lessons of progress.
Luke xiii. 31—35.
Luke xiv. 1—24.

1 According to Jewish tradition there were seventy (*Clem. Hom.* xviii. 4; cf. Gen. xlvi. 27) or seventy-two (Clem. Al. *Strom.* i. § 142; Clem. *Recogn.* ii. 42. Deus . . . in lxxii. partes divisit totius terræ nationes, eisque principes (Dan. x. 13) Angelos statuit.) different nations and tongues in the world. In the text of St. Luke ἑβδομήκοντα δύο is very highly supported.

The numbers twelve and seventy are combined, Numb. xxxiii. 9. Cf. Origen, *Hom.* xxvii. *in Num.* § 11, for an interpretation of the passage.

Even death itself cannot forestall the completion of the appointed work. Formalism is silenced; the poor are called, and the feast, which was despised by those who were first invited, is furnished with guests.

Lessons of discipleship.

The character of the true guest is next described in a series of parables which portray in the liveliest images the completeness of the sacrifice required of him, the universality of the invitation offered, the relative duties of disciples to one another. The quickening power of God and the fruitful struggles of penitence are pictured in the case of those who have been lost from Christ's fold[1] through carelessness, or have lain inactive in His Church from darkness, or have wilfully *joined themselves with the citizen of a far country.* The obligations of wealth and station, the duty of forbearance, and the power of faith, are seen to guide the Christian in social life; and when every claim is fulfilled he is still taught to feel that he is an unprofitable servant.

Luke xiv. 25—35.
Luke xv.
Luke xvi.—xvii. 10.
Luke xv. 15.
Luke xvii. 10.

Lessons of judgment.

The tokens of judgment grow clearer as we draw to the close of the section. Among the ten lepers who were healed, a Samaritan alone returned to give glory to God. If the Pharisees ask when the kingdom of heaven shall come, they are told that it is already within them. The day of vengeance for the elect is promised *quickly* (*v.* 8). Humility, childliness, and self-sacrifice — the opposites of prevalent vices — are set forth as the conditions of entrance into the kingdom; and if the words seem hard, one sentence marks the cause of the difficulty which men felt and the remedy for it: *That which is impossible with men is possible with God.*

Luke xvii. 18.
Luke xvii. 24.
Luke xviii. 1—8.
Luke xviii. 9—30.
Luke xviii. 27.

1 The difference between Luke xv. 4, Τίς ἄνθρωπος . . . ἀπολέσας ἓν . . . and Matt. xviii. 12, Ἐὰν . . . πλανηθῇ ἓν . . . marks the different aspects of the parable in the two Gospels.

The narrative of the Journey and the Conflict follows the same general outline as in the other Gospels, but with some characteristic additions.[1] Zacchæus, a publican and a sinner, was deemed worthy to entertain the Son of God and pronounced to be *a son of Abraham*. And as we noticed in St. Matthew that his first strain was repeated at the close of his Gospel, so in St. Luke the angelic hymn which was earliest sung in heaven in honor of the Saviour's birth, is reëchoed by the band of disciples as He approaches Jerusalem for the last time before the close of His work.[2] Yet again we hear the same peculiar tones of mercy and love on the road to Calvary, and from the very cross, and once more, when the risen Lord promises to His disciples His Spirit from on high before they preach the Word *to all nations*, beginning at Jerusalem.[3] From first

5. The kingdom claimed.

Luke xix. 9.

Luke xxiii. 39—43.

Luke xxiv. 49.

1 The following are the most remarkable additions to common narratives (besides those already noticed) which occur in St. Luke:

iii. 1, 2, the date of John's ministry.

iii. 5, 6, (ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ).

iii. 10—14. The social differences and duties of John's hearers.

iv. 1, πν. ἁγ. πλ.

iv. 6, 13, ἄχρι καιροῦ.

iv. 14—30.

iv. 35, μηδὲν βλάψαν αὐτόν.

iv. 42, 43, καὶ οἱ ὄχλοι — ἀπέσταλμαι.

vi. 8, αὐτὸς δέ — αὐτῶν. 11, αὐτοὶ δέ — ἀν.

vi. 12, καὶ ἦν διανυκτ. ἐν τ. προσ. τοῦ Θεοῦ.

vii. 20, 21; 29, 30.

viii. 1—3, 47, ἐν π. τοῦ λαοῦ.

viii. 2, κηρ. τὴν βασ. τοῦ Θεοῦ.

ix. 29, ἐν τῷ προσ. αὐτόν.

ix. 31, 32; 44, θέσθε ὑμεῖς . . . τ. λ. τ. Cf. xxi. 14.

xviii. 31, καὶ τελ. — τῷ ὑ. τ. ἀνθρ.

xviii. 34, καὶ ἦν τ. ῥ. τ. κεκρ. — τὰ λεγ.

xix. 37—40, 41—44.

xx. 16, ἀκουσ. δὲ εἶ. μὴ γένοιτο.

xx. 20, εἰς τὸ παραδ. — τοῦ ἡγεμ.

xx. 26, καὶ οὐκ ἴσχ. — ἐν. τοῦ λαοῦ.

xx. 34, οἱ υἱ. — ἐκγαμ.

xx. 38, πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζῶσιν.

xx. 39, 40.

xxi. 24, 34—36, 37, 38.

xxii. 3, εἰσ. δὲ ὁ Σ. εἰς Ἰ.

xxii. 15—18, 24—38, 43, 44, 45.

2 Luke xix. 38—40, ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνη καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις. Cf. ii. 14. Peace ratified in heaven is the pledge of peace to be realized on earth.

3 The view which has been given of St. Luke's Gospel as containing the offer of the Gospel to all — not to Jews only nor Gentiles only — is remarkably confirmed and explained by his "later treatise." For as in the one we mark the universality of Christ's promises, so in the other we see their full accomplishment. In the outset of the Acts (Acts ii. 9—11) we are told that Jews and proselytes, from Arabia to Pontus — from Parthia to Rome — heard the tidings of salvation in their own tongue; and the last glimpse of apos-

to last the same great subject abides. The Gospel of the Saviour begins with hymns and ends with praises; and as the thanksgivings of the meek are recorded in the first chapter, so in the last we listen to the gratitude of the faithful.[1]

Luke xxiv. 53.

tolic history is full of encouragement and hope, when it is recorded (Acts xxviii. 31) that, after turning to the Gentiles, Paul *received all that came unto him, and preached with all confidence the things which concern the Lord Jesus, no man forbidding him.*

Those writers who regard the book of the Acts as partial and incomplete, seem to have mistaken its entire purpose; for we do not require for our spiritual guidance a history of the Apostles, but a record of the establishment of the Christian Church. The title is not *the* Acts, but Acts of the Apostles (*πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων*)—such acts as should be significant to future times; and so we read in the book of all the modes of thought which Christianity encountered in Judæa, Asia, Greece, and Rome; we learn from it how far the Apostles modified the framework of our faith to build up the several Churches, and how far they selected a fit foundation for their teaching from the popular belief. The Gospels do not give us a life of Jesus, but a narrative of man's redemption; the Acts does not detail the fortunes of men, but sets forth the establishment of the various forms of Christian truth.

1 The language of St. Luke presents many peculiarities, some of which are characteristic; and a large number of words are common to the Gospels and the Acts, and do not occur elsewhere in the New Testament. The following peculiarities are the most remarkable:

(1) **Χάρις** (*χαριτόω*, i. 28) eight times. Elsewhere in Gospels only John i. 14, 16, 17. Common in Acts and Epistles.

(2) *σωτήρ*, i. 47; ii. 11 (John iv. 42). *σωτηρία*, i. 69, 71, 77; xix. 9 (John iv. 22). *τὸ σωτήριον*, ii. 30; iii. 6. General in Acts and Epistles. **Σώζειν** frequent throughout the New Testament.

(3) **Εὐαγγελίζεσθαι** (Matt. xi. 5 only) ten times. Frequent in Acts and Epistles. **Εὐαγγέλιον** (Matt., Mark, Acts, Epp., Apoc.) does not occur in the Gospels of St. Luke and St. John, nor in St. John's Epistles.

(4) **πλῆθος** eight times in Gospels, seventeen times in Acts; elsewhere in the New Testament seven times. *πλήρης* with gen. (John i. 14. Cf. Mark viii. 19) iv. 1; v. 12; eight times in Acts. *πλῆσαι*, *metaph.* (cf. *ἐμπλῆσαι*) six times in Gosp., nine times in Acts; not elsewhere. **πληροῦν** throughout the New Testament.

(5) **ὑπάρχειν** seven times in Gosp., twenty-four times in Acts, fourteen times elsewhere; not in other Gospels (*τὰ ὑπάρχοντα*, Matt. xix. 21; xxiv. 47; xxv. 14. In St. Luke eight times). *προυπάρχειν* in Gosp. and Acts once.

(6) **παῖς** (Θεοῦ) of David, Israel, Christ, i. 54, 69; Acts iii. 13, 26; iv. 25, 27, 30.

(7) **ἱκανός** nine times in Gosp., eighteen times in Acts, three times each in Matt. and Mark; elsewhere six times.

(8) **οἶκος**, *metaph.* (Matt. x. 6; xv. 24, *οἶκ.* Ἰσρ.) seven times in Gosp., nine times in Acts.

(9) **νομικός** (Matt. xxii. 35; Tit. iii. 13 only) six times in Gosp. **ἐπιστατής** (= Ῥαββεί) six times; not elsewhere. **ἀληθῶς** with **λέγω** (= *ἀμήν*) three times in Gosp.; not elsewhere.

(10) **ὕψιστος** (as an epithet of God) five times in Gosp., in Acts twice; elsewhere Mark v. 7; Hebr. vii. 1.

(11) Peculiar words (*α*) found only in St. Luke's Gospel and Acts:

διϊσχυρίζεσθαι, *διοδεύειν*, *ἐνεδρεύειν*, *ἐπιδεῖν*, *ἐντόνως*, *κατακλείειν*, *κατακο-*

General Summary.

Such appears to be, in rude outline, the general tenor of the Synoptic Evangelists; and though it be impossible to discuss within our present limits their more minute divergences in order and narration, yet it will be sufficiently clear that they subserve to special uses, that they imply and explain fundamental differences of scope, and unfold the Christian faith as it falls within each separate range. The events recorded by the synoptists are not generally distinct, but they are variously regarded, that we may be led to recognize the manifold instructiveness and application of every word and work of Christ. It may, indeed, be difficult to trace the progress of the subject, as it is taken up in each successive part of the histories; yet from time to time the same familiar notes recur, and we feel sure that a deeper knowledge and a finer discernment would lead us to recognize their influence, even in those passages which are most complicated and obscure. We have followed no arbitrary arrangement in classifying the miracles or discourses of our Lord, and yet in the mere simplicity of the Gospels we have traced the great signs of a new and noble sequence, too uniform and pregnant to be attributable to chance, too unpretending and obscure to be the work of design. And

λουθεῖν, κλάσις (ἄρτου), μεγαλεῖα, ὀχλεῖσθαι, προβάλλειν, προσδοκία, συμπληροῦν, συνεῖναι, τραυματίζειν (τραῦμα, Gosp. once) (all once in Gosp., once in Acts); διϊστάναι, ἐπιβιβάζειν, θάμβος (twice in Gosp., once in Acts); ἐπιχειρεῖν, ἴασις, [συναθροίζειν] (Gosp. once, Acts twice); διαπορεῖν, ἐπιφωνεῖν, εὐλαβής, καθίεναι, συναρπάζειν (Gosp. once, Acts three times); ἡ ἑξῆς, καθεξῆς (twice; three times); καθότι (twice; four times); ὀδυνᾶσθαι (three times; once); ὁμιλεῖν (twice; twice); συγκαλεῖσθαι, Midd. (three times; twice); συμβάλλειν (twice; four times).

(*b*) Found only in Gospel: πτοεῖσθαι, συκοφαντεῖν, ὑποχωρεῖν, χρεοφειλέτης (each twice); συνιέναι, συντυχεῖν, τελεσφορεῖν, φιλονεικία, etc. (each once).

(*c*) Occurring more often in Gosp. and Acts than in the other books of the New Testament: ἅπας, ἀτενίζειν, ἐξαίφνης, καλούμενος, ὀνόματι, κατελθεῖν, παραχρῆμα.

(12) καὶ ἐγένετο (ἐγέν. δέ) ἐν τῷ . . . In Gosp. twenty-two times, in Acts twice (Mark iv. 4). Compare ἐγένετο ὡς . . .

(13) ἦν, etc., with partic. In Gosp. forty-seven times, in Acts thirty-seven (Matt. ten; Mark twenty-seven; John eighteen).

In the numbers given some differences may arise from various readings, but they are, I believe, generally correct.

surely the conviction of this truth, more than any other, — incommunicable it may be, and ill-defined by language, — must fill us with the devoutest reverence for the Gospel histories, a reverence which is no vain "Bibliolatry," but a feeling which springs from the satisfaction of our inmost wants, and furnishes the fullest materials for patient study. For such a scheme of the holy Gospels is at once most worthy of their divine origin, and most consistent with their outward form; it realizes the individuality of their authorship, and explains the facts of their perversions; it satisfies, in its manifoldness, every requirement of the past and future relations of Christian truth; it falls in with early tradition, and opens to us a new view of the providential government of the Church; and, finally, it sets before us, in the clearest light, the combination of the human and divine, which lies at the basis of all revelation. The surest answer to all doubts, the readiest help in all difficulties, the truest consolation in all divisions, must spring from a real sense of the union of God and man in religion and in Scripture, which is the perfect record of the historical fulfilment of the union; and, if we read the words of inspiration humbly and sincerely, we have a promise which cannot fail.[1]

1 Orig. *Selecta in Num.* xi. 25: ἓν γὰρ ἐν Χριστῷ τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ μία διὰ πάντων ἡ ἐνέργεια.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE DIFFICULTIES OF THE GOSPELS.

Πεπαιδευμένου ἐστὶ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον τἀκριβὲς ἐπιζητεῖν καθ' ἕκαστον γένος, ἐφ' ὅσον ἡ τοῦ πράγματος φύσις ἐπιδέχεται. — ARISTOTELES.

The difficulties of the Gospels relatively inconsiderable.

If we have in any measure succeeded in establishing the idea of a distinct spiritual purpose and order in the writings of the several Evangelists, if we have shown that they rest upon the foundations of the past and meet the wants of the future, the remainder of our task will be easy. We shall *feel* the presence of the Holy Spirit throughout the whole narratives, and seek neither to limit His influence nor to define His operation. We shall recognize the divergences of the sacred writers, but still strive to discover the law of their course and the point of their reunion. We shall bear in mind how much is clear and evident in the written Word, while we ponder over dark and disputed sentences. We shall admit the obscurities which critics have detected in our Gospels, and endeavor to explain their origin, while we remember that, like the spots upon the surface of the sun, they neither mar the symmetry nor impair the glory of the great Source of our life and light which is imaged in them.

General grounds for meeting objections.

It would be a profitless task to discuss at length the objections which have been urged against distinct passages of the Gospels, for it is always the penalty of controversy that the whole is

neglected for details; but it may be not without use to indicate some general grounds for receiving with patience accounts which we cannot entirely reconcile. Such general considerations may lead us to wait for fuller knowledge, not with doubt and misgiving, but with a sure confidence in God's eternal truth.

1. *They spring from a wrong view of the nature of the Gospels.*

We have already noticed the error of those who contemplate the life of Christ, as recorded by the Evangelists, only outwardly, without regarding its spiritual significance. Hence it has followed, that details, historically trivial, have been deemed unfit subjects for the exercise of inspiration; and it has been argued, from the omission of a wide cycle of facts by the Evangelists, that their narratives are vague and incomplete. The first step to a right understanding of the Gospels must be the abandonment of this point of sight; we must regard them as designed to set forth the progress of a divine work embodied in the life of the Son of Man; we must compare them with the inward experience of Christians, and not with the annals of biographers; we must read them to learn the details of our redemption, and not to add some new facts to the chronicles of the world. Before we pronounce any clause or word in the Bible insignificant or needless, let us be assured that it contains no "mystery,"[1] that it teaches the humble student no new lesson in the knowledge of the world, or of man, or of God.

2. *From disregard of their distinct purposes.*

A second source of objections to the Gospels follows from the general disregard of their spiritual character. No attempt is made to realize their individual purposes, as representing natural and fundamental differences in the conception of the

1 Orig. *Philoc.* c. i. Πρέπει τὰ ἅγια γράμματα πιστεύειν μηδεμίαν κεραίαν ἔχειν κενὴν σοφίας Θεοῦ . . . ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ λαβόντες οἱ προφῆται λέγουσι. "διὸ πάντα πνεῖ τῶν ἀπὸ πληρώματος." Καὶ οὐδέν ἐστιν ἐν προφητείᾳ, ἢ νόμῳ, ἢ εὐαγγελίῳ, ἢ ἀποστόλῳ ὃ οὔκ ἐστιν ἀπὸ πληρώματος.

Life of Christ. If their individuality is asserted, it is as the partial result of design, and not as the spontaneous expression of a finite mind filled with the truth. To borrow an illustration from classical literature, the "Memoirs" of the Apostles are treated historically by a method which no critic would apply to the "Memoirs" of Xenophon. The scholar admits the truthfulness of the different pictures of Socrates which were drawn by the philosopher, the moralist, and the man of the world, and combines them into one figure instinct with a noble life, half hidden and half revealed, as men viewed it from different points; but he seems often to forget his art when he studies the records of the Saviour's work. Hence it is that superficial differences are detached from the context which explains them. It is urged as an objection that parallel narratives are not identical. Variety of details is taken for discrepancy. The evidence may be wanting which might harmonize narratives apparently discordant; but experience shows that it is as rash to deny the probability of reconciliation as it is to fix the exact method by which it may be made out. If, as a general rule, we can follow the law which regulates the characteristic peculiarities of each Evangelist, and see in what way they answer to different aspects of one truth, and combine as complementary elements in the full representation of it,[1] we may be well contented to acquiesce in the existence of some difficulties which at present admit of no exact solution, though they may be a necessary consequence of that independence of the Gospels which, in other cases, is the source of their united power.[2]

1 Orig. *In Joann.* Tom. x. 18. Ἐπίστησον δὲ ἐπιμελῶς, εἰ δυνατὸν ὡς τάς γε ἐναλλαγὰς τῶν γεγραμμένων καὶ τὰς διαφωνίας διαλύεσθαι παρὰ τὸν τῆς ἀναγωγῆς τρόπον, ἑκάστου τῶν Εὐαγγελιστῶν διαγράφοντος διαφόρους τοῦ λόγου ἐνεργείας ἐν διαφόροις ἤθεσι ψυχῶν οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ ἀλλά τινα παραπλήσια ἐπιτελούσας. The wisdom of Origen's principle is not shaken in any degree by his own failure in applying it.

2 Cf. Matt. viii. 5—10; Luke vii. 1—10.

Matt. xxvii. 5; Acts i. 18. See Gaussen, *Theopneustia*, p. 143 (*E. Tr.*), for a curious parallel.

John. xix. 17; Luke xxiii. 26. See

The neglect of the spiritual object of the Gospels, by which they are deprived of their proper character, leads necessarily to the disregard of their secondary character, as true narratives of facts. Many recent critics have not only reduced our Gospels to the level of ordinary writings, but have then denied their special and independent authority. They commonly admit a fact on the testimony of Josephus, which they question if it rest on the statement of St. Matthew or St. Luke.[1] They do not concede those privileges to the Evangelists which they yield to other historians in accordance with the received rules of evidence; and though it be said that the assumed inspiration of the Gospels removes them to a fresh position, it is clear that, in the interpretation of the outward text, they must be subject to the just arbitration of criticism; for the body is obedient to the laws of matter, though informed by a living spirit. We claim for the Gospels the strictest interpretation of language. Let the test be applied universally, and the apologist will gain as much as the interpreter. As soon as we disbelieve in the force of words, similarity is confounded with sameness;[2] differences are quoted as contradictions;[3] the general is asserted to be inconsistent

3. From a neglect of their proper historical authority.

p. 325, n. 6, and Orig. *Comm. in Matt.* Tom. xii. § 24.

1 Matt. xiv. 3.

Matt. xxiii. 35.

Matt. xxvii. 51 sqq.; 62—66; xxviii. 11—15 (Strauss, iii. 4, § 133).

Luke iii. 1 (Strauss, ii. 1, § 44).

Luke xxiii. 45 (Strauss, iii. 4, § 133). There is no mention of an *Eclipse*, but of *Darkness* (σκότος ἐγένετο. Matt. xxvii. 45; Mark xv. 33; Luke xxiii. 44). The objection is as old as the time of Origen, who answers it rightly: *Comm. Ser. in Matt.* § 134.

John i. 28; iii. 23; iv. 5. Cf. xviii. 1.

2 Matt. ix. 32—34; xii. 22—30.

Matt. xiv. 15—21; xv. 32—38. Cf. xvi. 9, 10.

Matt. xxvi. 6—13; Luke vii. 36—50.

Luke ix. 1 sqq.; x. 1 sqq.

John ii. 14—17; Matt. xxi. 12, 13.

John iv. 46—54; Luke vii. 1—10.

3 Matt. iii. 14; John i. 31. Cf. p. 293, n. 2.

Matt. xx. 29—34; Mark x. 46—52; Luke xviii. 35—43. Cf. Davidson's *Hermeneutics*, p. 558.

Matt. xxvii. 54; Luke xxiii. 47.

Matt. xxvii. 37; Mark xv. 26; Luke xxiii. 38; John xix. 19 (*The inscription on the Cross*). Cf. p. 326, n. 4.

with the particular;[1] the connection of subject is taken for a connection of time.[2]

4. From antecedent prejudices.

It cannot be denied that the real origin of many, perhaps of most of the objections to the Gospels, lies deeper than textual criticism. The objections to the record rest on a fundamental objection to the implied fact. An unexpressed denial of the possibility of miracles is the foundation of detailed assaults upon a miraculous narrative. Critical difficulties are too often, in the first instance, the excuse for a foregone conclusion, or at least fall in with a definite bias. A charge of prejudice is alleged against the defenders of the Gospels, and it lies more truly against those who attack them. The prevalence of a suspicion of all miraculous history, of a willingness to accept any explanation which may limit or modify its character, of a kind of satisfaction in believing that we may plausibly doubt some part of it and so question the whole, is far greater than we commonly admit even to ourselves. No one probably is free from the feeling; and it is well to consider how much of each difficulty is due to the nature of the fact, and how much to the nature of the evidence by which it is attested; how far it is a fair result of the text itself, and how far a natural consequence of the conception which the text contains. Christianity is essentially miraculous. This is a postulate of Biblical criticism; and it follows that miraculous circumstances are exactly in the same position in the Gospel history as natural circumstances in common history. If the postulate be granted, the conclusion is inevitable; if it be denied, argument is impossible. No external evidence can produce faith.

1 Matt. xi. 2 sqq.; John i. 34; iii. 27. Matt. xi. 14; John i. 21. Matt. xxi. 38; Acts iii. 17; xiii. 27. Matt. xxvi. 8; John xii. 4. Matt. xxvi. 69—75; Mark xiv. 66—72; Luke xxii. 56—62; John xviii. 17, 18, 25—27 (*The denials of St. Peter*). Cf. p. 301, n. John v. 31; viii. 14. A suggestive instance occurs in Matt. xx. 20; Mark x. 25, when we compare Matt. xx. 22 with Mark x. 38 (οἴδατε). Matt. xiv. 13; Luke ix. 10.

2 Matt. xxi. 19, 20; Mark xi. 20. Luke xxiv. 50; Acts i. 3.

Apart from narratives which involve this antagonism of principle, it may be observed that even in those passages which present the greatest difficulties there are traces of unrecorded facts, which, if known fully, would probably explain the whole;[1] further knowledge tends to remove, instead of increasing, objections; and few objections are admitted to be of force by all adverse critics. The heritage of scepticism is rather the settled spirit of doubt than the accumulated store of arguments. Each antagonist of Christianity thinks that the battle fails where he is not himself engaged. Isolated and independent efforts are opposed to the gathered strength which ages of faith have transmitted to the Church.

5. The gravest objections are uncertain.

It is, perhaps, the more necessary to insist on these particulars, as much of the criticism at the present day seems to assume that there is some resting-place between the *perfect* truthfulness of inspiration and the uncertainty of ordinary writing. A subjective standard is erected, which, if once admitted, will be used as much to measure the *doctrines* as the *facts* of Scripture; and, while many speculators boldly avow this, others are contented to admit the premises from which the conclusion necessarily follows. But, within the Church, criticism is the interpreter and assessor, and not the sole and final judge. The same Spirit which gave the Revelation, for the establishment of the outward society, will unfold its meaning, but not supersede its use. The Spirit and the Word work together, and not apart. To claim a distinct personal enlightenment, independent of a written Word, is to violate the highest attri-

Importance of feeling the literal truthfulness of Scripture:

1 Luke ii. 2, αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο, κ. τ. λ. The force of the objection lies in the neglect of the word πρώτη, which seems to refer to some other "taxing," with which we are unacquainted (1851). Cf. p. 313, n. 2.

Mark ii. 26, ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθαρ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως· not ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθαρ ἀρχιερέως (Luke iii. 2. Cf. Herod. i. 15, 56, 65, 94).

John xix. 14; Mark xv. 25. Cf. Townson, *Dissert.* VIII. 1, § 2.

We see the importance of this minute criticism in Mark xi. 13, ἔχουσαν φύλλα.

bute of man — his social dependence. To convert the written Word into a rigid code of formal teaching, independent of the abiding presence of the Spirit who draws from it lessons for each age, is to destroy the idea of a Church — that "Communion of Saints" which realizes in life the historic verities of Christianity. Both feelings alike, though in different ways, spring out of that tendency of our age which would obliterate the name of government and the claims of national life.

even when we cannot prove *it.*

Still we must not seek, by an excess of zeal, to limit the narratives of Scripture to any mechanical arrangement; they are *living oracles*, whose vitality consists in their integrity. It is enough for us to refute the conclusions of our adversaries, without imitating their subtleties. The great marks of the divinity of the Gospels are written on every page and included in every word. Their perfect adaptation to our wants is proved by the witness of our own hearts, not because we can *discover* truth, but because, by God's help, we can *recognize* it; and it is equally unwise and unchristian to mar our glorious heritage in the pursuit of a faithless knowledge, to impair its fulness, or abridge its scope, because our own reason, or that of others, is too proud to bow before the wondrous works and miracles consequent on the perfection and reality of a *God manifest in the flesh.* Surely here, if anywhere, it befits our weakness "to be thankful, and to wait."[1]

Acts vii. 38.

Hebr. xi. 1.

1 *Tim. iii.* 16. (ΘΣ *or* ΟΣ).

The relation of Faith to Reason in Scripture.

But, while either extreme of indifferentism and formal harmonization is alike hurtful, — for by the one we are apt to destroy our sense of moral beauty, and by the other our regard for moral

1 Cf. Orig. *Philoc.* c. 1. Ἀσφαλὲς οὖν τὸ περιμένειν τὴν ἑρμηνείαν τοῦ σαφηνιστοῦ λόγου, καὶ τῇ ἐν μυστηρίῳ σοφίας ἀποκεκρυμμένης, ἣν οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἔγνωκε κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου, φανερωθέντος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνοις παραπλησίοις διά τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν, καὶ τῆς γενομένης εἰς αὐτοὺς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν λόγου τοῦ ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν.

truth, — we are not to decline, with some, the labors of a searching criticism, or, with others, the veneration of the humblest faith; for it is only by the combination of these that the deepest meaning of Holy Scripture is laid open. Reason and faith are not antagonistic principles, but another form of the great antithesis which lies at the basis of all our knowledge. By the one we discover the human form, and by the other the spiritual basis of revealed truth. Reason gives us the laws which limit our human conceptions, as made in time and space, and Faith gives us those absolute ideas of spiritual things which reason embodies. The one answers to the human, and the other to the divine, in our nature; and both alike are addressed by the Word of God, and consecrated to the Christian's use.

1. *Difficulties are useful* Intellectually.

From this view of our constitution we may see that the very existence of difficulties in our Gospels — which are the groundwork of our *faith* — is a fresh incentive to vigorous and *rational* study. There is a noble remark of Origen,[1] which is true in a moral sense, and perhaps even literally, that "the Divine Word ordered some stumbling-blocks and stones of offence in the sacred records, that we might not be led away by the unalloyed attractiveness of the narration, and seek for nothing more divine." We feel assured that the Scriptures contain infinite depths, from our sense of the general dealings of Providence and of the wants of the Church; and the subtlest criticism discovers enough to encourage us to dedicate every energy to the investigation of their mysteries. If there were no need for rigorous criticism, no reward for acute philology, no scope for philosophical inquiry, in the study of the Bible, — if the text were uniform, the diction simple, and the connection

1 *Philoc.* i. 15, ᾠκονόμησέ τινα οἱονεὶ σκάνδαλα καὶ προσκόμματα καὶ ἀδύνατα, διὰ μέσου ἐγκαταταχθῆναι τῷ νόμῳ καὶ τῇ ἱστορίᾳ ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος· ἵνα μὴ πάντη ὑπὸ τῆς λέξεως ἑλκόμενοι τὸ ἄγωγον ἄκρατον ἐχούσης . . . μηδὲν θειότερον μάθωμεν.

obvious, — we might neglect the consecration of our entire faculties to divine ends;[1] while, as it is, we find in the human form, and the natural transmission of the sacred volume, the noblest field for our labors. If it be said that these subtleties are only for the scholar, the answer is obvious, that so are the objections to which they correspond. The Bible appeals to all as they are; no one occupies a position of superiority. The difficulties of Scripture are *useful intellectually*.[2]

2. Morally.

But, again, we must remember that all revelation is given to us as in a state of probation,[3] and that not only in reference to a part of our nature, but to the whole. We are subjected to a mental as well as to moral trial, or, rather, morality is extended to reason as well as to life; and we might expect that Scripture should furnish us with a proper training for both.

Philoc. i. 23.

"Believe, and then thou shalt find beneath the imaginary offence a full source of profit," was a saying of Origen's, never more truly applicable than in an age of unexampled restlessness. The outward moral temptation is now, perhaps, less formidable than heretofore, from the form of our civilization, while the inward struggle waxes fiercer and fiercer, as men seek not so much to live freely as to know fully, forgetting too often that love is the source of wisdom;[4] for "the chasms (and discrepancies) in the divine history afford room for the exercise of faith — a faith whose root is to be found, not in science, not in demonstration, but in simple and self-subduing submission of our spirits."[5] The difficulties of Scripture are useful *morally*.

Origen[6] will still furnish us with another remark: the

1 Arist. *Eth. N.* vi. 12.

2 Among the notes for Pascal's great *Apology* is the following: "Plusieurs Evangélistes pour la confirmation de la vérité. Leur dissemblance utile." (Ed. Faugère, ii. p. 371).

3 In addition to Butler, we may refer to Pascal's notes, Vol. ii. pp. 205, 265.

4 "Il faut aimer les choses divines pour les connaître." — *Pascal.*

5 Neander, *Life of Christ, Introd.*

6 *De Princip.* iv. p. 163 (i. § 7), ὥσπερ οὐ χρεωκοπεῖται ἡ πρόνοια διὰ τὰ μὴ

difficulties of the revelation in the Bible are strictly analogous to those of the revelation in nature. "In both we see a self-concealing, self-revealing God, who makes Himself known only to those who earnestly seek Him; in both we find stimulants to faith, and occasions for unbelief."[1] There are apparent anomalies in the phenomena of the material world, but their general uniformity teaches us that these are only discrepancies in appearance. There are difficulties in applying the great doctrine of gravitation, — as in the case of the tides, — but we *feel* that they arise not from any want of universality in the law, but from our ignorance of the conditions of the problem. There are also difficulties in Scripture; and shall we not rest assured, from that Divine wisdom which we can discern, that they spring only from our ignorance of the circumstances on which the question turns? If the Gospels had presented no formal offences, how soon should we have heard objections drawn from the general course of God's dealings! How readily should we have been reminded of the plausibility of human forgeries, and of the mystery of Divine Providence! It would have been even said,[2] that the advance of Christianity — which must be *folly to the Greek* — was due to the beauty of its external form, and the perfection of its superficial smoothness, and not to the power of its inner truth: whereas, at present, the discrepancies of Scripture lead us back to the Author of nature; and as we do not question His eternal Presence, though many details of His operation transcend our knowledge, so neither need we doubt the perfect inspiration of the Scriptures, though frequently we may be unable to recognize the treasure of God in the *earthly*

In reference to Nature.

1 *Cor. i.* 23.

2 *Cor. iv.* 7.

γινωσκόμενα παρὰ τοῖς γ' ἅπαξ παραδεξαμένοις αὐτὴν καλῶς, οὕτως οὐδὲ ἡ τῆς γραφῆς θειότης διατείνουσα εἰς πᾶσαν αὐτὴν, διὰ τὸ μὴ καθ' ἑκάστην λέξιν δύνασθαι τὴν ἀσθένειαν ἡμῶν παρίστασθαι τῇ κεκρυμμένῃ λαμπρότητι τῶν δογμάτων ἐν εὐτελεῖ καὶ εὐκαταφρονήτῳ λέξει ἀποκειμένῃ.

1 Neander, *l. c.*

2 Origen, *Philoc.* IV.

vessels which contain it. The difficulties of Scripture are useful as unfolding the true *analogy* of God's works.

But "not to rest in this school of nature," we must remember, in the midst of the doubts and perplexities which so easily beset us, that at present *we know but in part* the facts and the bearings of revelation. Dim views of a wider scope and a more perfect wisdom are ever opened before us. Faith looks forwards as well as inwards; and even now we see enough whereon to rest securely the firm foundations of our hope, possessing our souls in peace, till *that which is in part shall be done away*, — till the glorious buildings of the New Jerusalem and its heavenly splendors shall be fully disclosed, whereof at present we can but discern, amid the mists of earth, wondrous pillars and buttresses, or through some dim window the distant rays of that glorious Sun — even *the Lamb of God* — which shall at one time illumine the Holy City.

1 *Cor. xiii.* 9.

Rev. xxi. 23.

ΓΕΝΗΘΗΤΩ ΗΜΙΝ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΗΝ ΠΙΣΤΙΝ ΗΜΩΝ ΚΑΘ ΗΝ ΚΑΙ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΟΜΕΝ ΟΤΙ ΠΑΣΑ ΓΡΑΦΗ ΘΕΟΠΝΕΥΣΤΟΣ ΟΥΣΑ ΚΑΙ ΩΦΕΛΙΜΟΣ ΕΣΤΙ. — ORIGENES.

APPENDICES.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.

ON THE QUOTATIONS IN THE GOSPELS.

Οὐδέποτε οὕτως ἐλάλησεν ἄνθρωπος. — JOHN VII. 46.

THE quotations made from the Old Testament by our Lord and His disciples, give us, perhaps, the truest and most decisive view of the inspiration of the Bible; for no one, I suppose, will refuse that authority to the Gospels and Epistles which is assured to the Law and the Prophets. The Christian Councils must have had the same authority and guidance in deciding on the Canon of the new Scriptures as was enjoyed by the Jewish Church, nor can we believe that less grace was given to those who portrayed the substance of the Gospel than to those who saw its shadow; for the only alternative is to deny the need of an outward society and a divine Word for the fulfilment of the second dispensation. It will be seen from the following passages, taken from the books of Moses, the Psalms, and the Prophets, that a spiritual significance lies beneath the Bible as a whole; that its power and usefulness is not confined to striking predictions or definite precepts, but spread over simple historic details, and involved in the records of individual life. We may conclude this, —

The Inspiration of the Old Testament involves that of the New.

I. From the mode in which our Lord appeals to Scripture as decisive:

And that is proved I. By the quotations of our Lord;

(*a*) *In direct precepts:*

Matt. iv. 4, 7, 10; Cf. Luke iv. 4, 8, 12 (γέγραπται· εἴρηται· Deut. vi. 13, 16; viii. 3). Matt. ix. 13; xii. 7 (Hos. vi. 11).

Matt. xv. 4 (ὁ Θεὸς εἶπεν) Mark vii. 10 (Μωϋσῆς εἶπεν, Ex. xx. 12). Cf. Matt. xxii. 36, 38; Matt. xviii. 16. Cf. Deut. xix. 15.

(*b*) *In distinct prophecies:*

Matt. xi. 10 (οὗτός ἐστιν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται, Mal. iii. 1).

Matt. xxiv. 15. Mark xiii. 14 (τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ Δανιὴλ τοῦ πρ. Dan. ix. 27; xii. 11).

Matt. xxvi. 54 (πῶς οὖν πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί, ὅτι οὕτω δεῖ γενέσθαι; Cf. v. 56).

Luke vii. 27. Matt. xi. 10 (περὶ οὗ γέγραπται. Mal. iii. 2).

Luke xxii. 37 (τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί· Isa. liii. 12).

And significant:

(*c*) *In its secondary application:*

Matt. x. 35 (Mic. vii. 6). Matt. xii. 5 (οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε· Num. xxviii. 9).

Matt. xiii. 14, 15 (ἀναπληροῦται αὐτοῖς ἡ προφητεία· Isa. vi. 9, 11).

Matt. xv. 8, 9 (προεφήτευσεν Ἡσ. Isa. xxix. 13).

Matt. xxi. 13. Mark xi. 17. Luke xix. 46 (γέγραπται· Isa. lvi. 7).

Matt. xxi. 16 (οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε; Ps. viii. 2).

Matt. xxi. 42 (οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς); Mark xii. 10 (ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη); Luke xx. 17 (τὸ γεγραμμένον τοῦτο· Ps. cxviii. 22, 23).

Matt. xxvi. 31 (γέγραπται· Zech. xiii. 7).

John vi. 45 (γεγρ. ἐν τοῖς προφήταις· Isa. liv. 13).

John xiii. 18 (ἡ γραφή· Ps. xli. 9).

John xv. 25 (ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτῶν· Ps. xxxv. 19).

(*d*) *In its spiritual depth:*

Matt. xii. 40 (John ii. 1). Matt. xix. 4, 5 (οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε); Mark x. 6. Gen. i. 27; ii. 24.

Matt. xxii. 32 (τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ); Mark xii. 26 (οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ὡς εἶπεν ὁ Θεός); Luke xx. 37 (Μωϋσῆς ἐμήνυσεν· Ex. iii. 6, 16).

Matt. xxii. 43, 44 (Δανεὶδ ἐν πνεύματι); Mark xii. 36 (Δ. ἐν πν. ἁγίῳ); Luke xx. 41 (Δανεὶδ λέγει· Ps. cx. 1).

Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark xv. 34. Cf. Ps. xxii. 2.

Mark ix. 49.[1]

John x. 34 (γεγρ. ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν· Ps. lxxxii. 6).[2]

From these passages it will be seen that we must either accept the doctrine of a plenary inspiration, as we have already explained the phrase, or deny the *veracity* of the Evangelists. If our Lord's words are accurately recorded, or even if their general tenor is expressed in one of the Gospels, the Bible is indeed the "Word of God," in the fullest spiritual sense; for no scheme of accommodation can be accepted where it tends to lead men astray as to the sources of divine help.

II. By the quotations of the Evangelists.

II. The doctrine which we have seen to be implied in the language of our Lord is yet more fully unfolded by the Apostles and Evangelists. It will be enough for our present purpose to give a general table of the citations in the Gospels:

1 Cf. Olshausen, *Comm.* S. 555 ff.

2 Cf. Matt. xxvii. 46; Luke xi. 52 (Origen, *Philoc.* i. § 10); John v. 39, 46; vii. 38. xvi. 29, 31;

(*a*) *Distinct prophecies:*

Matt. ii. 6 (γέγραπται· Mic. v. 2).

Matt. iv. 15, 16 (ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ πρ. Isa. ix. 1, 2).

Matt. xii. 17–21 (ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθέν· Isa. vi. 1–4).

Matt. xxi. 5 (ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθέν· Zech. ix. 9); John xii. 15 (καθώς ἐστιν γεγραμμένον).

(*b*) *Typical acts and words fulfilled in the Gospel history:*

Matt. i. 22 (ὅλον γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου διὰ τοῦ πρ. Isa. vii. 14).

Matt. ii. 15 (ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου διὰ τοῦ πρ. Hos. xi. 1).

Matt. ii. 18 (τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥ. διὰ τοῦ πρ. Jer. xxxi. 15).

Matt. ii. 23 (ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥ. διὰ τῶν προφητῶν).

[Matt. iii. 3. Mark i. 3. Luke iii. 4. John i. 23.]

Matt. viii. 17 (ὅπως πληρωθῇ. Isa. liii. 4).

Matt. xiii. 35 (ὅπως πλ. τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ πρ. Ps. lxxviii. 2).

Matt. xxvii. 9, 10 (τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥ. [Zech.] xi. 12, 13).

John ii. 17 (γεγρ. ἐστίν· Ps. lxix. 9).

John xii. 38–41 (οὐκ ἠδύναντο πιστεύειν ὅτι εἶπεν Ἡσ..... ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος Ἡσ...ταῦτα εἶπεν Ἡσ. ὅτε εἶδεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλάλησε περὶ αὐτοῦ· Isa. liii. 1; vi. 9, 10).

John xix. 24 (ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πλερωθῇ ἡ λεγ. Ps. xxii. 18. Cf. Matt. xxvii. 35).

John xix. 36 (ἵνα ἡ γρ. πλ. Ex. xxii. 46; γραφὴ λέγει· Zech. xii. 10).

It may be worth while to enumerate some general conclusions to which this enumeration leads:

Deductions from the Apostolic usage.

1. There appears to be a distinct meaning in the different modes of quotation. Surenhusius[1] has made a valuable collection of the formulæ in use among the Rabbins, which may be compared with the Greek phrases; but the discussion of this question would necessarily lead us beyond the Gospels.

2. The usage of the Evangelists shows that they did not introduce the quotations into the speeches of Jesus. For while St. Mark and St. Luke do not quote the prophets in their own narratives, they agree exactly with St. Matthew in their records of our Lord's teaching.

3. The authority of Christ himself and of his Apostles encourages us to search for a deep and spiritual meaning under the ordinary words of Scripture, which, however, cannot be gained by any arbitrary allegorizing, but only by following out patiently the course of God's dealings with

1 In his Βίβλος καταλλαγῆς. Cf. supr. p. 53, n.

man.[1] There are traces even in the Old Testament of the recognition of this fulness of the written Word.[2] Such a belief lies at the basis of the arguments of St. Paul[3] and of the Epistle to the Hebrews;[4] and we shall find that it was ratified for at least three centuries by the common consent of the Church.

APPENDIX B.

ON THE PRIMITIVE DOCTRINE OF INSPIRATION.

Ὦ Τιμόθεε, τὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον, ἐκτρεπόμενος τὰς βεβήλους κενοφωνίας, καὶ ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως· ἣν τινες ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἠστόχησαν. — 1 TIM. VI. 20.

IN the present Appendix I shall endeavor to collect, as far as possible, all the chief opinions of the Fathers of the first three centuries on the nature of Inspiration. We may be inclined to judge some of their statements fanciful or unsound, but still it cannot be a profitless task to learn what they thought of our Bible, who found in its teaching a support in martyrdom; it cannot be unworthy of the most advanced Christian to treasure up the sayings of those who lived while an apostolic tradition still lingered among the disciples of St. John, St. Peter, and St. Mark.

In the course of our inquiry we shall meet with men who regarded our religion from the most opposite points of view. We shall hear the testimonies of the converted Jew, the awakened heathen, and the hereditary Christian — of those who found in the faith of Christ the fulfilment of ancient promises or early hopes, and of others who were driven to embrace it by the pressure of their own wants, after they had gone through the circle of philosophy. Yet more, we shall be obliged to recognize the various influences of Eastern and Western life. Palestine and Assyria, Antioch and Alexandria, — the seats of divergent systems of criticism and theology, — contributed to fill the ranks of Christian writers, and furnished words to express their new ideas. The voice of Christianity comes to us from Athens and Carthage, from Rome and Lyons. All these points

1 Those who wish to pursue this question further in relation to modern opinions, will do well to study Olshausen's beautiful tract, *Ein Wort über tiefern Schriftsinn*.

2 Olshausen, § 7; the passages in the Apocrypha are given in § 8.

3 Cf. 1 Cor, x. 1–12, 18; 2 Cor. iii. 7, 8 (Cf. Orig. *in Joan.* Tom. XXXII. § 17); Gal. iv. 21–31; Eph. v. 29–32 (Gen. ii. 24); Col. ii. 17.

4 The whole argument of the Epistle depends on the reality of the spiritual meaning of the Old Testament. Cf. Heb. iv. 5, 7; v. 5–12; vii.–x.; xii. 1.

In the Apocalypse also we find the same deep symbolism. Cf. xxi. 10–27.

must be carefully remembered if we wish to form an adequate idea of the real purport and true unity of the teaching of the Church. For in proportion as their differences of country, education, and temperament are greater, so much the more striking is the essential agreement of the early Fathers in points of faith and feeling; and if we can trace, under various forms, one great idea of inspiration in the scattered societies of ancient Christendom — if we can find it incorporated into distinct systems and acknowledged by the most incongruous minds — if the universal consent of antiquity lead us to Scripture for the groundwork of our creed — we shall surely acknowledge that tradition has done for us a noble and necessary work, by maintaining an inspired Bible, a definite canon, and a general method of interpretation.

For the sake of simplicity it will be best to follow the common arrangement of Church histories, and examine in succession the subapostolic Fathers (§ 1); the Apologists (§ 2); the Fathers of Asia Minor (§ 3); North Africa (§ 4); Rome (§ 5); Alexandria (§ 6); and the Clementines (§ 7).

SECT. I. — THE SUBAPOSTOLIC FATHERS.

Οὔτε γὰρ ἐγὼ οὔτε ἄλλος ὅμοιος ἐμοὶ δύναται κατακολουθῆσαι τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ μακαρίου καὶ ἐνδόξου Παύλου. — POLYCARP.

1. From the nature of the subapostolic writings all allusions to Inspiration are incidental. The first literature of a Church is rather practical than doctrinal, and we must endeavor to discover the teaching which it involves, rather than merely that which it expresses. Thus Barnabas uses such phrases as the following, when quoting Scripture: "The Lord saith in the prophet" (Ps. xvii. 45); "The Spirit of the Lord prophesieth" (Ps. xxxiii. 13). Again, he tells us that "the prophets received their gift from Christ and spake of Him," and that "Moses spake in the Spirit." Consistently with this view, he asserts the presence of a spiritual meaning in the Law and History of the Jews,[1] and discovers types of the Cross in the ancient Scriptures (Exod. xvii. 18, sqq.; Isai. lxv. 2; Num. xxi. 9). The number of those circumcised by Abraham (318, in Greek τιή) represents, he says, at once the name of Jesus (IH) and the figure of the Cross (T). Than this there is no truer (γνησιώτερος) word. But such knowledge was hidden in old time: "we have gained the right sense of the commandments, and speak as the Lord wished." We are, as it were, a new creation. The first tables of the Covenant

1. BARNABAS.
Ep. § 9.
§ 5.
§ 10.
§§ 8, 10, 11.
§ 14.
§ 9.
§ 10.
§ 6.

1 Rosenmüller (*Hist. Interpr.* I. 65 sqq.) has drawn a striking parallel between the interpretations of Barnabas and Philo.

which Moses brake because of the unworthiness of the people have been given to us by the Lord. "In us God truly dwells, that is, the Word of His faith (ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ τῆς πίστεως), the calling of His promise, the wisdom of His ordinances, the commandments of His teaching, *Himself prophesying in us*, Himself dwelling in us; by opening for us who were enslaved by death the doors of the temple, — even our mouth, — and by giving us repentance, He brought us into the incorruptible temple [*i. e.*, made us true temples of God]. He, then, that longeth to be saved, looketh not to man, but to Him that dwelleth in him and speaketh in him. . . . And one rule of those who walk on 'the way of light' is: 'Thou shalt guard what thou hast received, neither adding nor taking away from it.'"

§ 16.

§ 19. *Cf. Rev. xx.* 18, 19.

2. Clement of Rome quotes many passages from Scripture with the words: "for the Scripture saith;" "by the testimony of Scripture;" "the Holy Spirit saith." He exhorts his readers to "look carefully (ἐγ[κύπτετε]εἰς) into the Scriptures, which are the true [utterances] of the Holy Spirit." Again, he says: "Ye know, beloved, ye know well the sacred Scriptures, and have looked carefully into the oracles (τὰ λόγια) of [God];" and "the spirit of lowliness and awe (τὸ ὑποδεὲς) through obedience, not only improveth us, but also improved the generations before us, even those (unless we probably read καταδεξομένους with Davis) who received His oracles in fear and truth." In another place he speaks of "the ministers of the grace of God [the prophets of the Old Testament], who by the Holy Ghost spake of repentance." But the greatest effusion of the Spirit was reserved for the Christian Church, when our Lord sent forth his Apostles, even as He was sent by the Father, to preach the kingdom of God "with the full assurance and measure of the Holy Spirit (μετὰ πληροφορίας πνεύματος ἁγίου), when they had received the promises, and been fully convinced (πληροφορηθέντες) by the Resurrection, and confirmed in the word of God" (πιστωθέντες ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ); of whose number "the blessed Paul, at the beginning of the Gospel, in very truth wrote by inspiration" (πνευματικῶς, *divinitus inspiratus*. Vet. Int.) to the Corinthians.

2 Clemens Rom. *Ep. i.* 23, 34.
i. 13, 16. (*Is. liii.*)
Ep. ii. 2, 6.
i. 45.
i. 53.
i. 19.

i. c. 8.

i. 42.

i. 47.

Again, the epistle of Clement abounds in Old Testament illustrations. He traces in the men of old time the results of envy, and the blessings of faith, obedience, and humility. He recognizes, moreover, the lasting import of the recorded history, and the significance of the most minute details.[1] The scarlet thread which Rahab hung out of the window was "to show that a redemption (λύτρωσις) should be made by the blood of the Lord

i. 4, 9 17.
i. 11.
i. 12.

1 Compare the remarkable passage, Ephes. ii. 12.

for all who believe and hope upon God." The use as well as the language of Clement prove in what account he held "the Word of God." *i.* 13.

3. The short and affecting epistle of Polycarp contains little which illustrates our subject, though he tells us, with touching humility, that "neither he nor any like him is able to attain perfectly (κατακολουθῆσαι) to the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul" (contrast 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16), and seems for once to burn with the zeal of his master when he declares that "he is the first-born of Satan whoever perverts the oracles of the Lord to suit his own passions, and says that there is neither resurrection nor judgment." The last quotation is valuable, for, when compared with the passages of Clement cited before, it proves that the same term (τὰ λόγια) was used in quoting the old and new Scriptures. Again, Polycarp writes "that he trusts his hearers are well versed in the sacred writings (in sacris litteris)," alleging at the same time Psalm iv. 4; Ephes. iv. 26. Indeed, the words and spirit of the New Testament seem to be inwrought into his mind; for though he only once mentions the name of the sacred writer whom he quotes, there appear to be in his short epistle more than twenty distinct references to the Apostolic books.[1]

3. Polycarp. *c.* 3. *c.* 7. *c.* 12. *c.* 11 (*Paul*).

4. The transition from Polycarp to Ignatius is very striking, whichever recension of the Ignatian letters we may be inclined to adopt.[2] We read in one passage that the writer "trusts to attain to that lot to which he has been mercifully called, having fled to the Gospel[3] as to the flesh of Jesus, and to the Apostles as to the Presbytery of the Church;" and "yet more," he adds, "let us love the prophets, because they were the heralds of the Gospel (κατηγγελκέναι εἰς . . .) . . . and by belief

4. Ignatius. *Ep. ad Philad.* 5. *ad Magn.* 8.

1 Fevardentius, in his notes on Irenæus (III. 3, p. 118, App. Ed. Benedic.), quotes some questionable fragments from a MS. Catena on the Gospels, purporting to be the versions of some chapters of the *Responsions of Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna*, made by Victor of Capua (c. 480). Their character will be seen from the following quotations: Matt. xix. 5, "Deus vero qui per inspirationem divinam in corde Adam ista verba formavit ipse Pater a Domino recte locutus fuisse refertur; nam et Adam hanc prophetiam protulit, et Pater qui eum inspiravit recte dicitur protulisse." "Rationabiliter Evangelistæ principiis diversis utuntur quamvis una eademque Evangelizandi eorum probatur ratio; . . . curæ fuit eo uti proœmio quod unusquisque judicabat auditoribus expetere." Surely this is not the language of the apostolic age.

2 There are, apparently, only half as many references to Scripture in the shorter recensions of the Epistles as in the remains of Polycarp, though in bulk the former are, perhaps, ten times as great as the latter.

3 In opposition to Hefele and Niemeyer, I can only understand these words of written histories and epistles according to the context and the general usage of the words. Cf. Ussher, l. c.

in it were saved;" "for the divinest (θειότατοι) Prophets lived according to Jesus Christ. . . . being inspired (ἐμπνεόμενοι) by His grace;" . . . . "He was the subject of their preaching, and the Gospel is the perfection of immortality (ἀπάρτισμα ἀφθαρσίας)."

ad. Philad. 9. *Cf. ad Smyrn.* 7.

In one place Ignatius seems to claim for himself a direct communication from heaven: "I call you to witness that I knew this not from man (σαρκὸς ἀνθρωπίνης), but the Spirit proclaimed, saying, Do nothing without your bishop; keep your flesh as a temple of God; . . . . be ye imitators of Jesus even as He was of His Father;" yet again he disclaims the personal possession of this higher knowledge, which was reserved for the time "when he received the pure light" by death, and so became "a man of God." "I do not give you injunctions (διατάσσομαι)," he says, "as Peter and Paul: they were Apostles, I a condemned man." . . . . The Christian "who possesses the Word of Jesus is truly able to hear even His silence, that he may be perfect; that in what he speaks he may act, and in what he is silent his character may be known;" "the bishops" "too are in the mind (ἐν τῇ γνώμῃ εἰσιν) of Jesus, as Jesus is the mind of His Father."[1]

ad Philad. 7.
ad Trall. 5. (*So Syr.*)
ad Rom. 6.
ad Rom. 4.
ad Eph. 15.
ad Eph. 3.

5. Papias, who was a contemporary of Polycarp, is the first writer who distinctly recognizes the synoptic Gospels. In illustration of them, as it appears, he composed "An exposition of the Oracles of the Lord" (Λογίων Κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις), including in his book traditions still current, which might seem to throw light upon the apostolic narrative. Like Clement and the Alexandrine school, he is said to have given a spiritual interpretation to the history of the Creation (εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν πᾶσαν τὴν ἑξαήμερον νοήσας); and he is quoted by Andreas as a witness to the authority of the Apocalypse.

5. Papias. *Euseb.* H. E. *iii.* 39.
fr. ix. (Routh).
Prol. in Apoc.

6. *The Shepherd* of Hermas evinces by its form and reception[2] the belief of the primitive age in the nature and possibility of Inspiration. We have not to discuss here the apostolic claims of the book, but its existence is a distinct proof of the early recognition of a prophetic power somewhere existent in the Church. What was the character of this influence we may learn from the commencement of one of the visions: "And again the Spirit carried me away to the same place, . . . and when I had risen from prayer, I saw a Matron walking and reading a book, and she

6. Hermas.
Vis. ii. 1.

[1] In one passage Ignatius seems to express a sense of the deeper meaning of Scripture: *ad Ephes.* xix. (in Syr.). It will be seen that, with one exception, the passages quoted are not found in the Syriac version, at least in a perfect form.

[2] It is quoted with marked respect by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen. Cf. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 7; iii. 25.

said to me: 'Can you report this to the elect of God?' I said to her: 'Lady, I cannot retain so great things in my memory; but give me the book, and I will write them down.' — 'Take it,' she said, 'and restore it to me.' Now, when I had taken the book, I retired and wrote down everything letter by letter, for I did not discover the [divisions of the] syllables (non enim inveniebam syllabas; cf. Clem. Alex. *Str.* VI. § 131)." The Lady, he afterwards tells us, is the Church of God, and the revelation is to be sent to foreign cities, and delivered to the widows and orphans of the Church.[1]

Vis. ii. 4.

7. One more passage I will add, from an uncertain but very early writer,[2] who, addressing an inquiring heathen, describes the blessings of believers, among whom "the fearful strains of the Law are repeated, the grace of the Prophets recognized, the faith of the Gospels established, the tradition of the Apostles kept, and the grace of the Church triumphant (σκιρτᾷ). And if thou grievest not this grace thou shalt know what the Word speaks to men, by whom He pleases, when He will" (ὃ Λόγος ὁμιλεῖ, δι' ὧν βούλεται, ὅτε θέλει). In this noble sentence we see the first intimation of the co-ordinate authorities of the Bible and the Church, of a written record and a living voice; and it may well serve as a summary of the principles which we have traced in the earliest Fathers of the Christian faith.

7. EP. *ad* DIOGNETUM. § 11.

SECT. II. — THE APOLOGISTS.

οὔπω μέχρις αἵματος ἀντικατέστητε. — HEB. XII. 4.

1. The writings of the earliest Apologists, Quadratus and Aristides, have perished; but Eusebius has preserved a tradition that the former, like the daughters of Philip (Acts xxi. 9), was distinguished for his prophetic power — another intimation of the belief of the early Church in the real existence of a gift of Inspiration. Thus it is that the works of Justin, who, as we are told, still retained the mantle of the philosopher after he had adopted the doctrines of the Gospel, first present to us Christianity in relation with the ancient faith; and by their whole form and language they clearly show the necessary change which

1. *The early Apologists.* *H. E. iii.* 36; *v.* 17 (*on the authority of Miltiades*).

1 The whole section is very interesting. Origen (*Philoc.* I. 11) gives a singular allegorical interpretation of the two copies which Hermas is ordered to make. He represents Grapte as the *letter*, for she teaches widows and orphans — those who are not yet united with the Spouse of the Church, though divorced from their old connection, nor yet adopted children of the Father; while Clement typifies the *spirit*, extending its influence far and wide without corporeal restraints.

2 Cf. *Hist. of N. T. Canon*, pp. 95 ff. I do not remember to have read anywhere more eloquent outbursts of Christian feeling than are found in several chapters; *e. g.*, ch. v.

had taken place since the time of the Apostles in the hearers and teachers of the new religion.[1]

2. JUSTIN MARTYR.

2. The Scriptural quotations introduced by Justin into all his works are numerous, and his mode of citation is singularly expressive. He tells us of the "history which Moses wrote by Divine Inspiration (*ἐκ θείας ἐπιπνοίας*)," while "the Holy Spirit of prophecy taught through him." Again, he quotes the language of David, "who spake thus (Ps. xix. 2–5) through the spirit of prophecy;" and of Isaiah, who was moved (*θεοφορεῖσθαι*) by the same Spirit (Isa. lxv. 2; lviii. 2).

The Law. *Cohort.* 12. *Apol.* i. 44. *The Psalms.* *Apol.* i. 40. *Apol.* i. 35. *The Prophets.*

Yet more, he tells us that "as Abraham believed on the voice of God, and it was reckoned to him for righteousness, so do the Christians too believe on the voice of God, which has been addressed again to them by the Apostles of Christ, and proclaimed by the prophets,...whose writings — the memoirs of the Apostles,[2] or the books of the Prophets (*τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν*) — were read each Sunday (*τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ*) in the public assembly;" for "we have been commanded by Christ Himself to obey not the teaching of men (*ἀνθρωπείοις διδάγμασι*, but that which hath been proclaimed by the blessed prophets and taught by Him."

Dial. c. 119. *The New Testament.* *Apol.* i. 67. *Dial.* 48.

How glorious was the prophet's office in Justin's opinion we may imagine when he says, "that we must not suppose that the language (*λέξεις*) proceeds from the men who are inspired, but from the divine Word which moves them (*μὴ ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἐμπεπνευσμένων, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ κινοῦντος αὐτοὺς θείου λόγου*). Their work is to announce that which the Holy Spirit, descending upon them, purposes, through them, to teach those who wish to learn the true religion" (*τὴν ἀληθῆ θησέβειαν*). "For neither by nature nor human thought (*ἐννοίᾳ*) can men recognize such great and divine truths, but by the gift which came down from above upon the holy men [under the Jewish dispensation], who needed no art of words, nor skill in captious and contentious speaking, but only to offer themselves in purity (*καθαροὺς παρα-*

The Prophet's Office. *Apol.* i. 36. (*cf.* c. 33, and *Apol.* ii. 10. *Cohort.* 35). *Cohort.* c. 8.

1 The elders quoted by Irenæus make use of the writings of the New Testament as well as of those of the Old (*Hist. of N. T. Canon*, pp. 87, 88); and Eusebius (*H. E.* III. 37) speaks of Evangelists in the reign of Trajan as "striving to deliver to others the Scripture of the divine Gospels (*τὴν τῶν θείων εὐαγγελίων γραφήν*)."

2 *I. e.*, our Gospels (*Hist. of N. T. Canon*, pp. 115 ff.). It is very important to observe that the two classes of writings — the apostolic and the prophetic — are placed in the same rank throughout; for the Apostles, "by the power of God, announced to every race of men the Word of God, as they were sent by Christ (Matt. xxviii. 20) to teach all" (*Apol.* I. 39). Justin refers to "John, one of the Apostles," as having prophesied (*Dial.* c. 81).

σχεῖν) to the operation of the Divine Spirit, in order that the divine power of itself might reveal to us the knowledge of divine and heavenly things, acting on just men as a plectrum on a harp or lyre" (ἵνα αὐτὸ τὸ θεῖον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κατιὸν πλῆκτρον, ὥσπερ ὀργάνῳ κιθάρας τινὸς ἢ λύρας τοῖς δικαίοις ἄνδρασι χρώμενον, τὴν τῶν θείων ἡμῖν καὶ οὐρανίων ἀποκαλύψῃ γνῶσιν). However strictly we may be inclined to interpret Justin's metaphor, we must remember (as has been well observed) that the tone and quality of the note depend as much upon the instrument as upon the hand which plays it.[1] And how can we listen to the full and deep harmonies of the Bible without feeling that more than half their power and beauty lies in the divine union of the different human instruments through which the Spirit speaks, "perfecting one full message of salvation for those who will discern it, stopping and staying every inworking of the evil spirit, even as the strain of David stayed the evil spirit which oppressed the soul of Saul"?

Orig. in Matt. ii.

Justin's view of the Interpretation of Scripture is perfectly consistent with his doctrine of Inspiration. "There are," he tells us, "many revelations veiled in parables and mysteries, or expressed in symbolic actions, which prophets explained who arose after those who spoke and acted;" and "there is no profit in quoting the words or facts of Scripture unless we are able to render an account of them, a gift which cometh [to Christians] by the great grace of God;" for "the Scriptures belong to the Christian, and not to the Jew, who when he reads does not understand their meaning (νοῦν)." Thus he says, in his dialogue with Trypho, that "he can prove by a careful enumeration that all the ordinances of Moses were types and symbols and indications (καταγγελίας) of those things which were to be realized in the Messiah" (τῷ Χριστῷ γενέσθαι). The twelve bells which hung round the robe of the high-priest prefigured the twelve Apostles who were united "with our eternal Priest, by whose voice the whole earth was filled with the glory and grace of God and Christ." The Paschal Lamb was a type of the death of Christ, even as the two goats at the great Fast set forth His two Advents, and the offering of fine flour in the case of leprosy, "the remembrance of His Passion" in the Eucharist.

Interpretation.
Dial. § 68.

Dial. § 92.

Dial. § 29. *Cf.* Otto *l. c.*

The Ceremonial Law.

Dial. § 42. *Cf.* *Apol. i.* 32; *Dial.* § 53.

Dial. § 42.

Dial. § 40.

Dial. § 41.

Justin finds an equally deep significance in the facts recorded in the Old Testament. He sees symbols of the Cross in the tree of Life — in the brazen serpent — in Moses, as he stood victorious over Amalek — in the ensign of Judah, "whose horns are as the horns of a unicorn" (Deut. xxxiii. 17) — and in the very form of man. So, also, the events of patriarchal history are pregnant with meaning. The mar-

The Mosaic history.

Dial. §§ 86; 131; 90; (*cf.* 111); 91; *Apol. i.* 55.

[1] See the passage of Hippolytus quoted below, § IV. 4, p. 410.

riages of Jacob with Leah and Rebecca prefigured the union of Jesus with the Synagogue and the Christian Church: the spiritual sight of the Jews was weak, and Rachel concealed the gross gods of her fathers.

Dial. § 134.

These examples of the method of Interpretation which Justin followed will suffice.[1] We may add, however, that he does not seem ever to deny the literal truth of the narratives which furnish him with these divine analogies; on the contrary, in some cases he insists on the bare interpretation of the text with unnecessary strictness.

Dial. § 134.
Dial. § 131 *f.*

3. The apologetic discourse of Tatian, Justin's disciple, affords him little scope for speaking of inspiration; yet he draws a striking contrast between the positions of the heathen and of the Christian. "The Spirit of God," he says, "is not with all men, but abiding with some whose conversation is just (*παρά τισι τοῖς δικαίως πολιτευομένοις καταγόμενον*), and being united with their soul (*συμπλεκόμενον τῇ ψυχῇ*) it proclaimed to all other souls, by prophetic teaching, that which had been hidden; and those which obeyed wisdom attracted (*ἐφείλκοντο*) to themselves a kindred spirit, while those who did not obey... were found to fight against their God." In another place he notices the great antiquity of Scripture, and says that its prophetic power (*τὸ προγνωστικὸν τῶν μελλόντων*) was one of the grounds on which he was led to believe in its doctrine.[2]

3. TATIAN.

§ 13.

§ 29.

4. The language of Athenagoras, when speaking of the Prophets, is perhaps without parallel, and it has been regarded, with good reason, as expressing the doctrine of Montanism. He says that, "while entranced and deprived of their natural powers of reason (*κατ' ἔκστασιν τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς λο-*

4. ATHENAGORAS.

Leg. pro Christ. § 9.

1 Justin's principles in this respect may have been modified by his residence at Alexandria. He speaks with admiration of Philo and Josephus (*Cohort.* c. 10), and argues that the old philosophers "were compelled, by the Divine Providence acting in behalf of men, to say many things in support of Christianity" (*Cohort.* c. 14, *πολλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τῆς θείας τῶν ἀνθρώπων προνοίας καὶ ἄκοντες ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰπεῖν ἠναγκάσθησαν*).

2 He quotes John i. 5, with the words, "This is that which was said (*τὸ εἰρημένον*)."

The accounts of his Diatessaron are too vague to enable us to form any clear idea of its purpose. Eusebius (*H. E.* IV. 29) describes it "as a strange harmony and combination of the [four] Gospels;" nor does there seem any reason to suppose, with Neander (*Ch. Hist.* II. 167, n. Eng. Tr.), that apocryphal traditions were wrought into it. We find it used by many who followed the apostolic teaching (*ἀποστολικοῖς ἑπόμενοι δόγμασι*. Theodor. *Fab. Hær.* I. 20), and it commenced with the words, "In the beginning was the Word." Its similarity to the "Gospel of the Hebrews" probably arose from the omission of the history of the Infancy, which would militate against Tatian's Gnosticism (Epiphan. XLVI 1; Theodor. l. c. Cf. Olshausen, *Ueber die Echtheit u. s. w.* s. 335 ff.; *Hist. of N. T. Canon*, pp. 358 ff.).

γισμῶν) by the influence of the divine Spirit, they uttered that which was wrought in them (ἃ ἐνηργοῦντο), the Spirit using them as its instruments, as a flute-player might blow a flute." And again, under another image, he describes "the Holy Spirit, which works in those who speak prophetically, as an emanation issuing from God, and carried back to Him, like a ray from the sun" (ἀπόῤῥοιαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπόῤῥεον καὶ ἐπαναφερόμενον ὡς ἀκτῖνα ἡλίου). Thus the Christian "gives no heed to the doctrines of men, but those uttered (θεοφάτοις) and taught by God;" for "he has prophets as witnesses of his creed (ὧν νοοῦμεν καὶ πεπιστεύκαμεν), who, inspired (read ἔνθεοι for ἐνθέῳ) by the Spirit, have spoken of God and the things of God."[1]

§ 10.

§ 11. § 7.

5. Far different is the language of Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, — sixth in succession from the Apostles, — who addressed an admirable defence of Christianity, still extant, to a heathen, Autolycus. According to him, the inspired writers were not mere mechanical organs, but men who, coincidently with the divine influence, displayed a personal and moral fitness for their work. "The men of God being filled with the Holy Spirit (πνευματοφόροι Πνεύματος Ἁγίου) and gifted with prophecy, having inspiration and wisdom from God, were taught of Him, and became holy and just. Wherefore, also, they were deemed worthy to obtain this recompense, to be made the instruments of God (ὄργανα θεοῦ γενόμενοι) and receive (χωρήσαντες) the wisdom which cometh from Him, by which wisdom they spake of the creation of the world and all other things . . . which happened before their birth, and during their own time, and which are now being accomplished in our days; and so we are convinced that in things to come the event will be as they say." Again, he adds, that "the Christians alone have received the truth, inasmuch as they are taught by the Holy Spirit, who spake by the holy prophets, and [still] announces all things to them beforehand (τοῦ λαλήσαντος ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις προφήταις καὶ τὰ πάντα προκατ-αγγέλλοντος):" who is "the Beginning and Wisdom and the Power of the Most High," so that "the words of the prophets are the words of God." Moreover, "the contents of the Prophets and of the Gospels are found to be consistent (ἀκόλουθα), because all the writers spake by the inspiration of the one Spirit of God[2] (διὰ τὸ τοὺς πάντας πνευματοφόρους ἑνὶ πνεύματι θεοῦ λελαληκέναι).

5. Theophilus. *Euseb. H. E. iv.* 20.

ad Aut. ii. 9.

ii. § 33.

ii. § 10.
ii. § 34.
iii. § 12.

[1] It is singular that there is scarcely any trace of Allegorical Interpretation in Athenagoras. See Guericke, *Hist. Scholæ Catech. Alex.* ii. p. 50.

[2] We learn from Jerome that Theophilus composed a Commentary on the Gospels (*in Evangelium, i. e.*, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον); or perhaps a harmony (*IV. Evangelistarum in unum opus dicta compingens*). Cf. *ad Autol.* ii. 22: . . . "all the holy Scriptures teach us and all who were inspired by the Holy Spirit (πνευματοφόροι), of whom was John (Evan. i. 3)." Rosenmüller (*Hist. Interp.* i. 1, p. 200) quotes this passage to prove that Theophilus "distinguishes between the sacred 'Scriptures' and the writings of the Apostles." Surely the

SECT. III. — THE FATHERS OF THE CHURCH OF ASIA MINOR.

Ὁ ἔχων οὖς ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. — Apoc. ii. 7, 11, 13.

1. We have just seen that the early apologies for Christianity proceeded from heathen converts; in like manner, the first endeavor after an ecclesiastical history was made by a Hebraizing Christian, with whom the historical side of his faith had naturally the fullest significance. The fragments of Hegesippus contain little or nothing which bears on our inquiry; yet in one sentence, preserved in Eusebius, he seems to recognize authoritative Christian documents when he says that "in each city all is ordered according to the preaching (*κηρύσσει*) of the Law, of the Prophets, and of the Lord."[1]

1. Hegesippus.

H. E. iv. 22.

2. Melito, Bishop of Sardis, helps us by the titles of some of his treatises, and by his own personal reputation. We learn from Tertullian that he was accounted a prophet by very many, and Polycrates describes him as "having transacted everything by the Holy Spirit" (*ὁ ἐν Ἁγ. Πν. πάντα πολιτευσάμενος*). Among his works we find discourses "On [Christian] Conversation (*πολιτείας*) and Prophets," — "On Prophecy," — "On the Revelation of St. John," — and "The Key." The last-mentioned book necessarily suggests to us an anticipation of the Alexandrian school; and some examples of Melito's exegesis, probably borrowed from it, sufficiently indicate the extent to which he carried the typical significance of each word and detail of Scripture.[2]

2. Melito.

ap. Hieron. de Vir. Ill. c. xxiv. ap. Euseb. H. E. v. 24.

Euseb. H. E. iv. 26.

Routh, Rell. Sacræ, *i. pp.* 116 *sqq.*

3. A fragment of Claudius Apollinaris[3] furnishes us with another

distinction can be of little use to lower the authority of St. John. Elsewhere (*ad Autol.* III. 14) Theophilus quotes an injunction of St. Paul (1 Tim. ii.) as an utterance of "the Divine Word."

In one passage (*ad Autol.* II. 14), Theophilus draws a mystical meaning from the Mosaic account of the creation, but he also accepts all the details literally.

1 In another fragment, given by Routh (*Rell. Sacr.* I. p. 203, Ed. 1), he is represented as saying that "those who maintain the doctrine of 1 Cor. ii. 9, lie against the holy Scriptures and the Lord. Matt. xiii. 16." If there be no error in this quotation, it is a strange example of the literal style of interpretation which Origen had to meet. Cf. *Hist. of N. T. Canon*, p. 233, n.

2 Eusebius (*H. E.* IV. 26) has preserved an important letter of Melito, in which he relates what he has done to satisfy a friend's wish to become acquainted with the "Scriptures of the Old Testament" (*τὰ τῆς παλαίας διαθήκης βιβλία*). The phrase seems to imply New Testament Scriptures also.

3 In connection with this name we may quote the remarkable words of Serapion (Bp. of Antioch in the reign of Commodus) in reference to the false Gospel of St. Peter: "We receive Peter and the other Apostles as Christ; but those writings falsely ascribed to him we decline to receive through our experience" (Euseb. *H. E.* VI. 12).

instance of the typical interpretation of Scripture; but without dwelling any longer on these minute details, we must proceed (4) to the great work of Irenæus, which unfortunately has come down to us chiefly through the uncertain medium of a Latin version,[1] for no Greek MS. is known to exist. Reared under the teaching of Polycarp,[2] — whose words, he tells us, he remembered better than the events of his later life, — and succeeding a martyr in the bishopric of Lyons, Irenæus is a noble representative of the faith and zeal of the early Church. Then only does he seem to forget his master's lessons of peace and love, when he contends against those who deny the continual manifestation of God's Spirit in His Church, or of His providence in the world. So full and comprehensive is his treatment of inspiration, though he only discusses it incidentally, that it is difficult to convey a notion of its general bearing by isolated quotations. According to him, the successive dispensations of God wrought together to one great end by the operation of one Power, as "men were accustomed to bear (*portare*) God's Spirit and hold communion with Him." Thus "the prophet spake of the advent of the Word in the flesh, as acted on by His influence (*charisma*);" and "all who foretold the coming of Christ received their inspiration from the Son;" for "how could Scripture testify, as it does, of Him alone, unless all things had been revealed by one and the same God, through the Word, to believers?" Yet till His advent "Christ was, as it were, the hidden treasure in the field of Scripture, since He was [only] indicated by types and parables;...for all prophecy, till its accomplishment, is full of riddles and ambiguities to men." To us, however, "the Apostles, by the will of God, have consigned (*tradiderunt*) the Gospel in the Scriptures to be the ground and pillar of our faith,...and by them we have learnt the truth, that is, the doctrine of the Son of God.....For after that our Lord rose from the dead, and they were clothed with the power of the Spirit from on high, they were filled with a perfect knowledge in all things" (*de omnibus adimpleti sunt, et habuerunt perfectam agnitionem*).[3] Consequently "they are beyond all falsehood" (*extra omne mendacium*), though they speak "according to the capacity of their hearers, talking

3. Claudius Apollinaris. *Routh, i. p.* 150.
4. Irenæus.
Euseb. H. E. v. 20.
General view of Inspiration.
adv. Hær. iv. 14, 2.
iv. 20, 4.
iv. 7, 2.
iv. 11, 1.
iv. 26, 1.
iii. 1, 1.
iii. pref.
iii. 1, 1.
iii. 5.

1 Massuet's remarks on Irenæus' view of Scripture are so essentially polemical as to be almost valueless (*Dissert.* III. 1, 2).

2 In connection with this name we may again refer to the letter of Polycrates (Bp. of Smyrna in the reign of Severus), in which he tells us "that having examined the whole of holy Scripture (on the question of Easter), he is not afraid of his opposers; for those greater than himself have said, It is right to obey God rather than man" (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24).

3 So again (III. 12, 5): αὗται φωναὶ τῶν μαθητῶν τοῦ κυρίου τῶν ἀληθῶς τελείων μετὰ τὴν ἀνάλεψιν τοῦ κυρίου διὰ πνεύματος τελειωθέντων. . . .

blindly with the blind" (*cæcis cæca confabulantes*). Each, too, preserves his own individuality; thus, "St. Paul frequently uses hyperbata on account of the rapidity of his utterance and the vehemence of the Spirit which is in him (*propter velocitatem sermonum suorum et propter impetum qui in ipso est spiritûs*); as, for instance, in Gal. iii. 19 we must suppose a man asking the question and the Spirit answering it; and so, again, in 2 Thess. ii. 3." But we must not imagine that the truth was thus impaired by the human agent, or the significance of words destroyed. "Matthew might have said, 'The generation of *Jesus* was on this wise,' but the Holy Spirit, foreseeing the corruptions of the truth, and fortifying us against their deception, says, by Matthew, 'The generation of *Christ* was on this wise.'"

iii. 7.

iii. 16, 2.

Moreover, Irenæus sees a mystical fulness and meaning in the four Evangelists: "As God made all things in fair order and connection, so was it needful that the [outward] form of the Gospel should be well framed and fitted together;" and "as there are four[1] regions of the world in which we are, and four general winds, — as the Church is scattered over the whole earth, and the Gospel is the pillar and support (*στήριγμα*) of the Church, — we might expect it should have four pillars [and four winds as it were], breathing on all sides immortality, and kindling [the divine spark] in men." Again: as in the ancient Church the visible form of God rested on the four-faced cherubim, "so Christ, when manifested to men, gave us his Gospel under a fourfold form, though held together by one spirit," and on these Gospels he rests (*τὰ εὐαγγέλια ἐν οἷς ἐγκαθέζεται ὁ Χριστός*).

The Gospels.

iii. 11, 9.

iii. 11, 3.

iii. 11, 8.

In many of his general views of Scripture, Irenæus anticipates the thoughts and language of Origen. He tells us that "the Scriptures are perfect, inasmuch as they were uttered (*dictæ*) by the Word of God and His Spirit, though we want the knowledge of their mysteries;" and how much, he adds, is unexplained to us in the operations of nature — the rising of the Nile, the migration of birds, the ebb and flow of the tide; "is it, then, a hard case that — as in the outward world some truths are, as it were, sacred to God (*ἀνάκειται τῷ Θεῷ*), while some have come under our knowledge — some of the difficulties in the Scriptures, which are all full of spiritual meaning (*πνευματικῶν*), should be explicable by the grace of God, while the solution of others must rest with Him, and that not only in this world (*αἰῶν*), but also in the world to come; that God may still teach, and man still ever learn from God?" The revelations of the Bible may seem too meagre to satisfy our curiosity; yet "no small punishment (*ἐπιτιμία*) will be his who adds to or takes from the Scripture." The details may seem

Deeper meaning of Scripture.

ii. 28, 2.

1 Compare a very striking passage in the symbolism of the number four in a fragment of Victorinus, *de Fabr. Cœli;* Routh, *Rell. Sacræ*, III. 456; Crosnier, *Iconogr. Christ.* pp. 50, 51; Philo, *de M.* §§ 15, 16.

insignificant; yet "nothing is empty or without meaning in the dealings of God." The connection of its parts may seem perplexing; yet "all Scripture, as it has been given to us by God, will be found to be harmonious." The interpretation of its teaching may be difficult; yet "we guard our faith, which has been admitted (*perceptam*) by the Church, and which, like a precious gift stored up in a fair vessel, is ever renewed (*rejuvenescens*) by the Spirit of God, and gives new life (*rejuvenescere facit*) to the vessel in which it is. For this gift of God is entrusted to the Church, to give life to the world (*ad inspirationem plasmationi*) as the soul to the body, and in it [the gifts of faith entrusted to the Church] lies the enjoyment of the Holy Spirit sent by Christ, which is the earnest of our immortality, the confirmation of our faith, the ladder by which we ascend to God. For where the Church is, there is also the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and all grace; but the Spirit is Truth;" and Truth is one; for we acknowledge as one the God of Creation and the God of Redemption, the author of the old dispensation and the author of the new; "we follow Him alone as our Teacher, and regard His words as the rule of Truth" (*regulam veritatis habentes ejus sermones*).

v. 20, 1. *cf. Rev. xiii.* 8; *xxii.* 18, 19. *iv.* 21, 3. *ii.* 28, 2. *iii.* 24.

iv. 35.

The doctrine of Irenæus on the Millennium illustrates his view of the literal truth of Scripture, while it also shows the influence of his Asiatic master. On other occasions, also, he adheres so strictly to the text as to draw arguments from isolated details of parables, and the natural coloring of language; moreover, he strongly opposes the system of the Gnostics, who based the truth of their opinions on numerical analogies and verbal symbols, though he himself admits the propriety of such subtle inquiries when pursued for the illustration of that which is admitted on other grounds. There can be no doubt that he recognizes an under sense (ὑπόνοια) in Scripture, and allows the symbolic meaning of the gifts and sacrifices of the Mosaic law, since heavenly truths can only be conveyed under earthly forms. Again, he sees figures of national and individual application in the records of the chosen people, — as when he acknowledges a type of the Gentile church in the marriage of Moses with the Æthiopian, and explains at some length the history of the birth of Phares and Zara, as foreshadowing the fortunes of the two covenants.[1] In another place he contrasts the mother of the human race with the mother of the Saviour: "What the Virgin Eve bound by her want of faith, that the Virgin Mary loosed by her faith." He finds types of Christ

Scriptural Interpretation.

iv. 33; *ii.* 34, 1.

ii. 24, 1 (*Jesus*). *Cf. Stieren l. c.* *The Law.* *iv.* 19, 1.

History.

iv. 20, 12. *iv.* 25, 2.

1 This method of typical interpretation he justifies by the authority of tradition (*presbyter dicebat*) in the case of the spoiling of the Egyptians. iv. 30, 1.

in the rod of Moses, "which, assuming a body (*incarnata*), confuted and destroyed all the opposition of the Egyptians [1] to the dispensation of God"— in the brazen serpent — in Joseph — and in Joshua, who completed what Moses had commenced, and for manna gave the people corn, which is "the first-fruits of life."

iii. 22, 4.
iii. 21, 8.
iv. 2, 7; *fr. p.* 346, *ed. Bened.*; *fr. p.* 345.

In many cases the explanations of Irenæus seem arbitrary and incoherent, from the want of any such general principle as guided the speculations of Origen. Thus he finds a type of the Church in Lot's wife, who became a pillar of *salt*, and, according to tradition, unchanging and incorruptible. Again, he likens the boy who led Samson to John the Baptist, and the two pillars of the building which he destroyed, to the two Covenants by which the world is supported. We are told, moreover, that he interpreted the Fall spiritually, and not historically, and maintained his view by very weighty arguments.

Indefinite.

iv. 31, 3.
fr. p. 346.
fr. p. 343.

The instances already quoted clearly show the general principles which Irenæus applied to Holy Scripture, acknowledging at once the mysteries of its letter [2] and of its spirit. To this inner sense of the Word of God he tells us that the Christian will ever strive to penetrate, by the help of daily experience and the use of appointed ordinances; [3] he will gather all the analogies of the outer world which may serve to direct his judgment, and scrutinize all the records of revelation which may enlighten his mind and extend his knowledge. The works of nature and the words of God combine to train and perfect the race of man, "in which are accomplished those mysteries into which angels desire to look, that they may trace the workings of that Wisdom by which Creation is made conformable and united to the Son."

Scripture to be combined with nature.

iv. 32.

v. 36 *f.*

SECT. IV. — THE FATHERS OF THE ROMAN CHURCH.

Ὅσα προεγράφη, εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν προεγράφη. — Rom. xv. 4.

There is something mournful in the silent, shadowy line of Roman bishops during the first three centuries; their voices seem only to be

1 The relations of the Jews to the Egyptians are perpetuated in those of the Christian Church to the unbelieving world in all ages. iv. 30.

2 In his explanation of the history of Lot (Gen. xxx. 30–8), he evidently maintains its real truth, while he justifies the relation as properly typical.

3 Cf. iii. 4, 1; iv. 33, 8; for further illustration of Irenæus' views on the Church. He speaks in a very remarkable passage (ii. 3, 4, cf. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 7) of the continuance of the powers of exorcism, prophecy, and healing in the Church at his own time. Compare, also, for a strong assertion of the same belief, the author quoted by Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 17.

heard when they claim the powers which their successors gained. The only famous Roman writers of the period were Caius and Novatian, who were presbyters, and Hippolytus, Bishop of Portus, whose education was wholly Eastern. Yet we must remember here the practical tendencies of the national character, which were alike displayed in the absence of theological studies, and in that zealous liberality which was regarded as the traditional glory of the Roman Church.

Dion. Cor. ap. Euseb. H. E. iv. 23.

1. In a fragment preserved in Eusebius, Caius seems to regard "revelations" as a mark of an apostle,[1] and in the same place uses the striking phrase, "the Scriptures of God." In another fragment, which is attributed by some to Caius, the writer speaks of the followers of Artemon, "who fearlessly laid their hands on the divine Scriptures, saying that they corrected them...How great is the daring of their error," he adds, "cannot be unknown even to themselves; for either they do not believe that the divine Scriptures were spoken by the Holy Spirit (Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι λελέχθαι), and are unbelievers; or they hold themselves wiser than the Holy Spirit, and we must say they rave" (δαιμονῶσιν).

1. Caius.

Euseb. v. 28; cf. Routh, ii. p. 18 sqq.

2. The famous fragment on the Canon had been falsely attributed to Caius, but it is certainly of the same date.[2] We find in this, probably, the first distinct recognition of the Inspiration of the Gospels, which are regarded as formally divergent, yet one in their great end. "Though various elements are inculcated (*licet varia principia doceantur*) in each, still the faith of believers differs not, since everything concerning the Nativity and Passion and Life [of our Lord] is declared in all of them by one and the self-same guiding Spirit" (*uno et principali*[3] *Spiritu*).

2. *Fragm. de Canone.*

Routh, Reli. Sacræ, *iv.* 3.

3. The writings of Novatian are full of quotations from the Old and New Testaments, and his view of their authority is clear and wide. He regards the whole Law as spiritual, "for divine ordinances must be received in a divine sense;" and traces the symbolic meaning of the Mosaic restrictions on food. The books of the prophets furnish him with a clear proof of God's providence, "which not only extends at all times over individuals, but also over cities and states, whose issues God declared by the words of His servants (*vocibus prophetarum cecinit*), yea, even over the whole world." And the forms of the prophetic language prove the certainty of their predictions; for they use the past tense in speaking of the future, since "divine Scripture regards as accomplished that which will,

3. Novatian.

de cib. Jud. c. 2.

de Trin. c. 8. (ed. Rig.).

de Trin. c. 28.

1 Κήρινθος δὲ δι' ἀποκαλύψεων ὡς θρὸς ὑπάρχων ταῖς γραφαῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑπὸ ἀποστόλου μεγάλου γεγραμμένων . . . τερατολογίας . . . ἐπεισάγει . . . ἐχ- . . . Euseb. *H. E.* III. 28.

2 Cf. *Hist. of N. T. Canon*, pp. 235 ff.

3 *i. e.*, ἡγεμονικῷ, cf. Routh, l. c.

beyond all doubt, come to pass." Yet more grace was given to the writers of the New Covenant, for though "the prophets and Apostles were inspired by one and the self-same Spirit, still on the former He came but for a time (*ad momentum*), while He abode with the latter always. To the one some degree of His influence was vouchsafed; on the other His whole energy was poured. In the one case it was a scanty gift, in the other a bounteous loan (*large commodatus*), not set forth before the resurrection, but conferred by it according to Christ's promise (John xiv. 26) of a Comforter, ...who strengthened the hearts and minds of the Apostles, who made clear to them the mysteries of the Gospel (*distinxit evangelica sacramenta*), who dwelt within them and enlightened their minds on divine things."

id. c. 29.

4. There appears to be no reason for doubting the tradition which represents Hippolytus of Portus as the disciple of Irenæus. In him we find a real link between the Asiatic and Alexandrian schools, for Jerome tells us that he preached before Origen. His writings exhibit the same deep sense of the spiritual meaning of Scripture[1] as we have already traced in his immediate teacher and in earlier writers. He regards that which has once been revealed by God to man as still full of instruction and wisdom after the primary application is gone. "The Law and the Prophets were from God, who in giving them compelled His messenger to speak by the Holy Spirit, that receiving the inspiration of the Father's power (τῆς πατρῴας δυνάμεως τὴν ἀπόπνοιαν λαβόντες) they may announce the Father's counsel and will. In these men therefore the Word found a fitting abode (πολιτευόμενος) and spoke of Himself; for even then He came as His own herald, showing the Word who was about to appear in the world.". . . . . .

4. Hippolytus.

c. Noetum, §§ 11, 12.

de Antichristo, § 2.

"These blessed men . . . . spake not only of the past, but also of the present and of the future, that they might be shown not to be for a time merely (πρόσκαιροι), but heralds of the things to come to all generations. . . . . For these Fathers, having been perfected by the Spirit of prophecy, and worthily honored by the Word Himself, were brought to an inner harmony (ἑαυτοῖς ἡνωμένοι), like instruments, and having the Word within them, as it were, to strike the notes (ὡς πλῆκτρον) by Him they were moved, and announced that which God wished. For they did not speak of their own power (be well assured),[2] nor proclaim that which they

1 See *de Antichr.* §§ 14, 15, 23. He quotes Rev. xiii. 10, and suggests the words ΤΕΙΤΑΝ, ΕΥΑΝΘΑC, and ΛΑΤΕΙΝΟC, as satisfying the number which "the Holy Spirit mystically showed forth" (*de Antichr.* 50). The same names are given by Irenæus (v. 30). See others in Fevardentius's note; the zealous Franciscan quotes "Martin Lauter" as one "who could not escape the name of Antichrist," but inclines to adopt "Maometis" as the true solution of the number. For a comparison of the "allegories" of Hippolytus with those of Origen, see Bunsen, I. 302 (ed. 1).

2 Μὴ πλανῶ: this parenthetical phrase occurs also in [Hipp.] *adv. Hær.* x. 33 (Bunsen, I. p. 272).

wished themselves, but first they were rightly endowed with wisdom by the Word, and afterwards well foretaught of the future by visions, and then, when thus assured (πεπεισμένοι), they spake that which was [revealed] to them alone by God."

It will be readily seen how widely this view is removed from that of Athenagoras, though conveyed under a similar metaphor, differing from it, indeed, just as the analogous description of Justin. The instrument here is first tuned to express the Divine strain; the moving power dwells within as a vivifying principle, and does not act from without on an involuntary subject. The reason is cleared and not clouded; the melodies of heaven are fitted to the words of men, not by an arbitrary power, but by an inward affinity. "The blessed prophets," to use another image, "are eyes of Christ." "They ministered the oracles of God for all generations." So, then, it is our duty to listen to the faintest voice of the Bible, to trace its relation to ourselves and its source from above us: "As the divine Scriptures proclaimed the truth, so let us view it; all they teach let us acknowledge by the growth of Faith (ἐπιγνῶμεν); as the Father pleaseth to be believed, let us believe Him; as the Son pleaseth to be glorified, let us glorify Him; as the Holy Spirit pleaseth to be given, let us receive Him; not according to our own choice, or our own mind (νοῦν), forcing to our own tastes that which has been given by God, but as He chose to show the truth through the Holy Scriptures, so let us view it." c. Noet. § 1.

SECT. V. — THE FATHERS OF THE NORTH-AFRICAN CHURCH.

τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντες. — Rom. xii. 11.

The relation of the North African to the other Churches.

We have now traced the history of the doctrine of Inspiration as unfolded in the Greek and Roman Churches; we have seen the same great principles enunciated by those who claimed to draw their doctrine from St. John, and by those who sought to base their authority on St. Peter. Whether it were viewed as part of the heritage of that wide Christian family which Irenæus loved to contemplate, or as the bond of that great power which silently grew at Rome, Holy Scripture was still held to supply the believer with the divine elements of his life and faith. We have yet to consider our subject in relation to two other Churches, and two other forms of mental development — those of North Africa and Egypt. In the writers of North Africa, whether at Carthage or Hippo, we find an intensity of zeal, a depth of feeling, a power of intuition, but little modified by cautious criticism or severe logic. The aspirations of Tertullian after a stricter life led him into Montanism; and the craving for a clearer knowledge at first united Augustine with the Manichees. We shall thus see how the doctrine of Inspiration was regarded by men of a warmer

temperament and a more restless faith, who sought out the truth with earnestness, and embraced whatever conclusion they obtained without reserve. Indeed, the whole character of the African Church is emotional, if we would distinguish it from the doctrinal and practical types of Asia and Rome. But while the Churches of North Africa, Asia, and Rome, combined to look at Christianity as a great historic fact, rather than as the final satisfaction of the ill-expressed wants of man, the Alexandrians sought to follow out this latter view, by bringing all that was grand and beautiful in human systems into a spiritual harmony with Divine Truth.

1. On one point, it has been well observed,[1] Tertullian never doubted; whether Catholic or Montanist, he still maintained alike the Inspiration of the Old and New Testament Scriptures. Whether he be writing to the heathen, the heretics, or the orthodox, he expresses the same belief in the same unwavering language. He tells us in his noble Apology that "God sent forth, from the first, men who, by their justice and innocency, were worthy to know God and to make Him known, and filled them to overflowing (*inundatos*) with the Divine Spirit;".... and so "gave us a written Testament[2] (*instrumentum litteraturæ*), that we might more fully and more deeply learn of Him, and of His counsels, and of His will." Nor does he scruple to call these books the "writings" (*litteras Dei*) and the "words of God" (*voces Dei*), which the Christian studies for warning or remembrance, and to which he looks "as the food of his faith, the spring of his hope, and the bulwark of his trust."

1. TERTULLIAN.

Apol. 18.

de Anima, 2. *Apol.* 31.

Apol. 39.

Like all the other Fathers whom we have examined, Tertullian sees a profound unity in the dispensations of God. "The same divine power (*divinitas*) was preached in the Gospel which had ever been known in the Law, though the discipline was not the same." "The Law, indeed, is the root (*radix*) of the Gospels;" and "in succession all the Prophets utter the words of the same God (*os prophetarum ejusdem Dei vocibus sonat*), enforcing the same law by an iteration of the same precepts." He even goes farther back than Moses for the first elements of the ancient Covenant. He traces the development of this dispensation in Paradise and among the Patriarchs, apart from the ceremonial observances of the Jewish ritual. Abel, Enoch, Melchisedec, and Lot, were accepted by that God, "who, according to the circumstances of the times, reshapes (*reformantem*) the precepts of His Law for the salvation of men" (l. *salutem*).

The unity of all Scripture.

adv. Marc. x. 2. *c. Gnost.* 2. *id.*

adv. Jud. c. 2.

1 By Maréchal, *Concordantia Patrum*, I. p. 162; a work which is admirably executed, and is well worthy of the Benedictine fame.

2 Tertullian is the first writer, I believe, who uses the word "Testamentum" in its ordinary acceptation, though it seems to have been current before his time. [Marcion] duos deos dividens proinde diversos, alterum alterius *Instrumenti* vel (quod magis usui est dicere) *Testamenti* . . . *adv. Marc.* IV. 1.

Thus Prophets, Evangelists, and Apostles, are placed by Tertullian in one rank as God's ministering servants. Christ spoke by Moses, "for He was the Spirit, of the Creator;"... and "the prophecies are the voice of the Lord." The madness (*dementia*) of those who deny that the Apostles knew all things,[1] or who admit that they knew all, but maintained that they did not reveal all things to all men, is equally reprehensible. The four Gospels, he tells us, are reared on the certain basis of Apostolical authority, and so are inspired in a far different sense from the writings of the spiritual Christian. "All the faithful, it is true, have the Spirit of God,[2] but all are not Apostles"..... "The Apostles have the Holy Spirit in a peculiar sense; they have it in the works of prophecy, and in the operation of mighty powers (*efficacia virtutum*), and in the gift of tongues,[3] not as possessing the influence in part as the rest."..... The revelation of the Apostles is the revelation of Christ; and "happy is that Church"—he is speaking of the Roman Church as it then was—"which combines the Law and the Prophets with the writings of the Evangelists and Apostles, and draws her faith from them."....

Inspiration under the New Covenant.
adv. Marc. iii. 16. *Cf. de Orat.* 9. *de Cor.* 9.

adv. Marc. iii. 6; *iv.* 13.
de Resurr. Carn. 22.
de Præscr. Hær. 25.
adv. Marc. iv. 2.
de exh. Castit. 4.
id.

de Præscr. Hæret. 21.
id. 36.

This being the case, we might expect that Tertullian would reject that which is not proved by Scripture,[4] and bid such as tampered with the Sacred Volume, fear the woe destined for those who add to or take from it;" while he himself "adores its fulness which reveals the Worker and the works;" which admits of wide application, and universal reference; for "all Scripture is fit for edification, being inspired by God." Nay, more, he even thinks that "the Scriptures were so arranged by the will of God that they might afford materials for heretics, since it is written that heresies must be, which could not be without the Scriptures."

The peculiar authority of Scripture.
adv. Hermog. 22.
id.
de hab. Mul. 3.

de Præscr. Hær. 39.

In his Principles of Interpretation Tertullian exhibits an equal sense of the truthfulness and depth of the Bible. "The language of the Prophets," he says, when arguing from their language on the Resurrection, "is generally allegoric and figurative, but not always;... many of their words can be maintained in a naked and simple sense.[5] But, nevertheless, in

The Interpretation of Scripture.
de Resurr. Carn. 20.

1 In reference to Gal. ii. 11, he remarks rightly: Conversationis fuit vitium non prædicationis. *De Præscr. Hær.* 22.

2 This doctrine was part of the "Regula Fidei" (*de Præscr. Hær.* 13): [Profiteamur Jesum Christum] misisse vicariam vim Spiritus Sancti qui credentes agat.

3 *Documento linguarum*, as a friend suggests to me for *documentorum linguam*.

4 Cf. *de Monog.* 4. Negat Scriptura quod non notat; and *de Cor. Mil.* 2. Prohibetur quod non ultro est permissum.

5 In all such cases Tertullian seems inclined to destroy the primary histor-

other places[1] he admits the mystical import even of numbers, and traces a symbolism of the Apostolic twelve in the twelve *fountains* of Elim, the twelve *gems* of the high-priest's robe, and the twelve *stones* selected by Joshua from the Jordan. He finds a figure of Holy Baptism in the pool of Bethesda, — though this was effective only once a year, but that is so always; and though that wrought (*operabatur*) temporal health, while this renews (*reformat*) eternal vigor. The same Sacrament was still more clearly foreshown in the passage of the Red Sea; and as "after the flood, — the Baptism of the World, so to speak, — by which the ancient sins of man were cleared away, the dove first brought the olive-branch of peace, so, when we rise from the Baptismal font, the Dove, — the Holy Spirit, — flies to us, sent forth from heaven, where the Church is the antitype of the ark."

adv. Marc. iv. 13.
de Bapt. 5.
de Bapt. 9.
de Bapt. 8.

At the same time Tertullian urges us to employ "the rudder of interpretation, ... for no divine utterance is so unconnected, that the words only can be maintained, and not their general bearing (*ratio*);" for we must adhere "to the rule of the Church (*regula Ecclesiæ*), which she received from the Apostles, and the Apostles from Christ, and Christ from God;". . . while we may be assured, that "where there is seen to be truth of discipline and Christian faith, there will there be the truth of the Scriptures, and of interpretation, and of all traditions."[2]

Subject to the Church.
de Præscr. Hær. 37.
de Præscr. Hær. 19.

2. Cyprian's doctrine of Inspiration is scarcely less exact, though less express. He more frequently shows his sense of the value of the "divine Scriptures" by quoting their testimonies,[3] than by fixing their authority. The books of the Old and New Testaments are to him "the fountains of divine fulness

2. Cyprian.
Testim. i. Pref.
id.

ical fulfilment of the prophecy, regarding the employment of the tenses as arbitrary, since "with the Deity there is no difference of time, for with Him eternity itself brings all time to the same uniform relation" (*dirigit uniformem statum temporum*) (*adv. Marc.* III. 5). "Eternity hath no divisions of time" (*non habet tempus æternitas*) (*adv. Marc.* I. 8). Pantænus, Novatian, and Irenæus, seem to have held the same doctrine.

1 Compare his explanation of Isa. vii. Non solum sonum nominis spectes sed et sensum . . . nobiscum Deus; . . . spolia autem Samariæ ipsos magos; . . . regem autem Assyriorum Herodem intellige . . . (*adv. Marc.* III. 12). Cf. Just. M. *Dial.* § 77.

See other examples *adv. Marc.* III. 18.

2 Cf. Bp. Kaye's *Essay on Tertullian*, pp. 290-304; and especially p. 297, n. (ed. 2), for the idea of primitive "Tradition" in relation to the doctrine of the English Church. This tradition was merely hermeneutic, and not an independent source of doctrine.

3 Cyprian composed three books of "Testimonies," containing a selection of texts from Scripture, arranged for doctrinal purposes, at the request of a friend.

The quotations from Cyprian's correspondents are given in brackets.

from which the Christian must draw strength and wisdom;" the source of those "divine commands (*magisteria*) by which God has vouchsafed to train and instruct us, that, enlightened by his pure and bright radiance, we may hold the way of life through their saving mysteries" (*sacramenta*). They are "the foundation of our hope, the bulwark of our faith, the support of our hearts, the guide of our path, the safeguard of our salvation." In the Scriptures the Christian must find "the torch which shall kindle his faith" in the hour of danger; "the arms with which he shall face the terrors of persecution and the coming of Antichrist;" and "the trumpet which shall rouse him to the battle." When writing to future martyrs, Cyprian says, "that his poor skill, aided by divine inspiration,[1] shall bring forth armor for them from the precepts of the Lord." . . . "I know," he adds, "that the intricacies of human speech must be removed, and only those things set down which God says, and by which Christ exhorts His servants to martyrdom." We read in his writings, again and again, that the Holy Spirit spake in the Law and in the Gospel, — by Prophets, Apostles, and Evangelists. "By Him the Prophets were quickened to a knowledge of the future." By Him the Apostles teach us, "what they learnt from the precepts of the Lord and heavenly revelations" (*cœlestibus mandatis*), being "full of the grace of the inspiration of their Master" (*dominicæ inspirationis*). By Him, too, according to the promise, the Christian answers his accusers in the hour of death; "for we do not speak, but the Spirit of the Father, who departeth, not from His confessors, and Himself speaketh in us, and shareth our crown." And thus it is that the Power of God lives in the Church, "which, like Paradise, includes within her walls all fruit-bearing trees, which she waters with four rivers, even the four Gospels, and on which she pours, with a heavenly stream, the grace of a saving baptism."[2]

de Orat. Dom. i.

[*Ep. xxxi.* (26) 5.]

Ep. lviii. (56) 7; *cf. Ep. vi.* (81) 2.

[*Ep. xxxi.* (26) 4.]

de Exhort. Mart. Præf. 1.

id. 4.

de Lapsis, 7.

Ep. lviii. (56) 5, 6.

Ep. lviii. 3.

de Op. et Eleem. 9.

Ep. lviii. (56) 5.

Ep. lxxiii. 10.

Yet more; the teaching of Scripture — whether by History or Prophecy, by Laws or Psalms — is full of deep meaning, and its spiritual import is perfect, — "the Gospel cannot stand in part and fall in part," — nor is it limited in its application like the doctrine of men; so that Cyprian describes a selection

Cf. Ep. lxix. (76). *de Lapsis*, 20.

1 I am not sure that Maréchal is right in referring these words to the Holy Scriptures. Cf. *Ep.* LXXIII. s. f. Libellum "de bono patientiæ" quantum valuit nostra mediocritas *permittente Domino et inspirante* conscripsimus.

2 In one place Cyprian seems to draw a distinction between the writings of the Bible: "Much hath God chosen to be spoken and heard through His Prophets; yet how much greater are those words which the Son of God speaketh — which the Word of God, who was in the Prophets, testifieth by His own voice." — *De Orat. Dom.* § 1.

of texts which he made under a remarkable similitude: "they are," he says, "as the very wool and purple from the Lamb by whom we are redeemed and quickened, of which each may make for himself a robe, ... that, having covered their former nakedness, all may wear the dress of Christ, arrayed in the sanctification of heavenly grace." Among the types which Cyprian quotes, we find the Church prefigured by "the robe without seam," by the ark, and by Rahab. He sees a spiritual meaning in the account of the raising of the Shunammite's son, from which he deduces the propriety of Infant Baptism; and discovers a symbol of the Eucharist in the "bread and wine," which Melchisedec offered to Abraham, and, again, in the blessing of Judah. He recognizes alike the authority and the mystery of Scripture; and declares the peculiar and lasting functions of the Spirit in the Church and in the Christian.[1]

de Exhort. Mart. Præf. 3.

de Unit. Eccles. 7.

Ep. lxix. (76) 2, 4.

Ep. lxiv. (59) 3.

Ep. lxiii. 4, 6.

3. Lastly, the sentiments of Cyprian were shared by the other bishops of the African Church of his time. In the account of the Council of Carthage, on the rebaptization of heretics, we find that many of those present based their judgments expressly on the authority of Scripture, using such language[2] as shows most clearly the feelings with which they regarded it.[3]

CONCIL. CARTHAG.

SECT. VI. — THE FATHERS OF ALEXANDRIA.

Ἀλεξανδρεὺς τῷ γένει, ἀνὴρ λόγιος, δυνατὸς ὢν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς. — ACTS XVIII. 24.

The designs of the Macedonian conquerer in founding Alexandria were more than fulfilled. He wished to unite in that city the East and West by the bonds of commerce and the intercourse of daily business;

1 In connection with Cyprian we may quote the following passage from Firmilan (Bp. of Cæserea in Cappadocia): "The Divine Word surpasses the nature of man, nor can the soul form a perfect and entire conception of it, and therefore there is so great a number of Prophets, that the manifoldness of Divine wisdom may be distributed among many. Whence also [at a later time] the first is ordered to keep silence in prophesying, if a revelation shall have been made to a second" ([Cypr.] *Ep.* LXXV. 4). It would be impossible to find a more distinct recognition of the separate purposes of the sacred writers.

2 *E. g.*, "Scripturæ Sanctæ" (5, 6, 74); "Scripturæ deificæ" (8); "Hæreticos — decerpentes sancta et admirabilia Scripturarum verba execrandos censeo" . . . (31); "Divinæ Scripturæ" (33).

3 The very remarkable poem of Commodian — one of the most interesting specimens of rude Latin now remaining — offers the same kind of mystical interpretations as Tertullian and Cyprian. For instance, addressing a Jew, he says (§ 39): "Inspice Liam typum Synagogæ," etc. So again he says: "In te Apostolus clamat, immo Deus per illum" (§ 58).

and it proved the point of their religious contact, and the centre of a new spiritual life. The faith of Palestine and the reason of Greece existed there side by side, till they were prepared to received the principle of a combined vitality in the preaching of Christianity. The colony of Jews at Alexandria, — "the glory of Israel," as they were called, — adopted the language, and learnt the doctrines of Greek Philosophy; they recognized the element of good which it contained,[1] and, doubtless, if they did not teach, at least in turn suggested fresh thoughts to its masters. The Jewish Rabbi became an instructor of the Ægyptian king, and "the entire interpretation of all the books of the Law (*τῶν διὰ τοῦ νόμου πάντων*) was completed under the prince surnamed Philadelphus." We may believe that the later writers of this school lost sight of the stern realities of Jewish history, and, in anticipation of a wider future, forgot the meaning of the past; yet, even Philo professed only to follow the principles and patterns of men of old time, who interpreted allegorically the philosophy of their fathers (*τὴν πάτριον φιλοσοφίαν ἀλληγοροῦντες*); and the writings of the Apocrypha exhibit unequivocal marks of the same view of Scripture. However this may be, it cannot be denied that the views of the allegoric school were first accepted and then systematized by the Christian fathers, and we shall endeavor to show in what way the unscientific criticism of Clement, which was based on the mere feeling of the depth of the sacred writings, was reduced to symmetry and order by Origen, whose views of inspiration, with all the faults of his Eastern ardor, are perhaps the noblest and worthiest which have ever beeen set forth.

The Alexandrine School.

2 Macc. i. 10.

de Vit. Contemp. p. 893 D.

Sirac. xxiv. 23–9.

1. Clement's doctrine of the plenary Inspiration of Scripture is at once rigid in its primary form and wide in its general application. He recognizes the working of Providence in the moral teaching of Greeks and Barbarians, and traces the origin of Pagan philosophy to the same God (*ὁ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς φιλοσοφίας δοτὴρ τοῖς Ἕλλησι*) who was the Author of the Mosaic and Christian covenants, and compares the Jewish prophets with those among the heathen "whom He raised up as prophets in their own dialect, and separated from common (*χυδαίων*) men, as they were able to receive the Divine favor;" while in another place he does not hesitate to call philosophy "a peculiar covenant (*οἷον διαθήκην οἰκείαν*) given to the Greeks on which might be built the philosophy of Christ."[2] But it was by "the masters of Israel" that God led men properly to the Messiah, speaking to them in the Law,[3] the Psalms,[4] and the

CLEMENS ALEX. *Str. vi.* 8, § 64. *Str. vi.* 5, § 42.

Str. vi. 8, § 67. *cf. Str. i.* 5, § 28.

Pæd. i. xi. § 96. *Protr. i.* § 5,

1 Olshausen, *Ein Wort u. s. w.* §§ 18, 19.

2 In illustration Clement quotes the Κήρυγμα Πέτρου. He asserts explicitly the inspiration of this work (*Str.* VI. 15, § 128), as well as that of the Shepherd of Hermas (§ 121).

3 *Str.* II. 23, § 146.

4 *Pæd.* II. 10, § 110. Ὁ λόγος τοῦτο

Prophets;[1] for, "disregarding the lifeless instruments, — lyre and harp, — the Word of God reduced to harmony by the Holy Spirit not only this world, but man the microcosm, *both body and soul*, and so makes melody to God through that many-voiced instrument, and says to man: Thou art my harp, my flute, my temple: my harp, from the harmony [of many notes], — my flute, from the Spirit that breatheth through thee, — my temple, from the Word that dwelleth in thee." . . . "Truly of man the Lord wrought a glorious living instrument after the fashion of His own image; one which might give every harmony of God tuneful and holy" (*ὄργανον Θεοῦ παναρμόνιον, ἐμμελὲς καὶ ἅγιον, σοφία ὑπερκόσμιος, οὐράνιος λόγος*). Thus the foundations of our faith rest on no insecure basis, "for we have received them from God through the Scriptures," . . . "of which (*ὧν γραφῶν*) not one tittle shall pass away without being accomplished; for the mouth of the Lord, the Holy Spirit, spoke it" (*ἐλάλησε ταῦτα*); "and we have believed on Him through His voice; and he that believeth on the Word, knoweth that the thing is true, for the Word is truth; but he that believeth not on him that speaketh, disbelieveth God:" for he disbelieveth "that which hath been spoken by the Holy Spirit for our salvation" (*τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος σωτηρίως εἰρημένα*).

Protr. i. § 5.

Str. ii. 4, § 12. *Protr. ix.* § 82.

Str. ii. 4, § 12.

Str. vi. 15, § 126.

The Gospel dispensation is still more glorious than the Law: "the Prophets were perfect in prophecy, the just perfect in righteousness, ... but the Apostles were fulfilled (*πεπληρωμένοι*) in all things." Yet "there is no discord between the Law and the Gospel, but harmony, for they both proceed from the same Author" (*ἑνὸς ὄντος ἀμφοῖν χορηγοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου*), "differing in name and time to suit the age and culture of their hearers (*καθ' ἡλικίαν καὶ προκοπὴν οἰκονομικῶς δεδομέναι*), by a wise economy, but one potentially (*δυνάμει*)," since "the faith in Christ and the knowledge (*γνῶσις*) of the Gospel is the explanation (*ἐξήγησις*) and fulfilment of the Law."[2] In all the Scriptures, — "in the Law, in the Prophets, and in the blessed Gospel," — "which are ratified by the authority of Almighty power," — "*κυρίας οὔσας ἐξ αὐθεντείας παντοκρατορικῆς*) we "have the Lord as the spring of our teaching, who, by the various ministrations of His servants, *in sundry times and in divers manners* from beginning to end guides the course of knowledge."

The New Testament.

Str. iv. 21, § 135.

Str. ii. 23, § 146.

Str. ii. 6, § 29.

Str. iv. 21, § 136.

Str. iv. 1, § 2. *Str. vii.* 16, § 95.

Clement is not inclined to undervalue human learning, yet he adds that

1 *Protrept.* VIII. § 78. Ἱερεμίας δὲ ὁ ψάλλει διὰ Δαβὶδ περὶ τοῦ κυρίου λέγων (Ps. xlv. 8 sq.). προφήτης . . . μᾶλλονε δὲ ἐν Ἱερ. τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐπιδείκνυσι τὸν θεόν.

2 Cf. *Str.* VII. 16, § 103; *Adumbr. in Petri Ep.* 1m. I. 12; *Pædag.* III. 12, § 94.

"the reading of the Scriptures of the Lord is necessary for the demonstration of what the Christian teacher brings forward;" and as they are the basis of our spiritual knowledge so are they also the means of quickening our spiritual vision. "The Christian training exercises our mind and awakens our intelligence, begetting in us an inquiring and sagacious spirit (*ἀγχίνοιαν ζητητικήν*), through that true philosophy which we have found, or rather received from Him who is the Truth (*ἣν . . . . . παρ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας ἔχουσιν οἱ μύσται*). We may have fallen from our original glory, yet Clement bids those "whose mental eye has been dulled by evil rearing and instruction to come to their proper light, seeking the truth which sets forth that which is unwritten in writing" (*ἐπὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν τὴν ἐγγράφως τὰ ἄγραφα δηλοῦσαν*); and to come with humility, for "some patch together divers fabrications and falsehoods that they may seem to reject the Scriptures, — that is, the Holy Spirit, — with a show of reason;" — with patience, for some "have refused to admit them after a superficial perusal, having lacked the zeal to penetrate the depth of their meaning;" — and with obedience, "for he ceases to be a man (*θήριον γένοιτο*), so to speak, who spurns the tradition of the Church, and lightly turns aside (*ἀποσκιρτήσας*, to the opinions of human heresies." And then he says, quoting the words of St. Paul (2 Tim. iii. 15), "the Scriptures are truly holy, for they are writings which make us holy and make us godlike (*τὰ ἱεροποιοῦντα καὶ θεοποιοῦντα γράμματα*); and of these holy writings and words the Bible is composed, which the same Apostle calls *inspired by God, being useful for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.*"

The relation of Scripture to Man.
Str. vi. 11, § 91.
Cf. 15, § 128.
Str. i. 5, 32.

St. i. 1, § 10.

Str. vii. 16, § 99.

Str. vii. 16, § 98.

Str. vii. 16, § 95.

Protr. ix. § 87.

The method of Interpretation adopted by the Alexandrine Fathers serves to place their view of Inspiration in the clearest light; for it was not to them, as it might seem now, a mere exercise of ingenuity, but an earnest search after a wider and more certain knowledge (*γνῶσις*). Clement maintains the existence of an allegoric meaning throughout the whole of the Bible, whose deeper mysteries are only seen "by the light which dawns on those who are truly initiated in knowledge, and seek the truth in love. "Moses," he tells us, "was a living law guided by the gracious Word" (*νόμος ἔμψυχος τῷ χρηστῷ λόγῳ κυβερνώμενος*), so that his writings are still full of instruction, though their literal acceptation has passed away.[1] The details of patriarchal history,[2] and the

Interpretation.

Str. vi. 15, § 129.

The Law.
Str. i. 26, § 167; *cf.* § 169.
Str. vi. 17, §§ 84; 86.

1 Cf. *Str.* II. 15, § 67. The Ten Commandments have a philosophic as well as a natural sense; — "Even the two tables may be a prophecy of the two Covenants." *Str.* VI. 16, §§ 133 sqq.

2 For instance, he explains the history of Abraham in the following way, apparently after Philo: Divine Wisdom (Sarah) brings no fruit at first to the believer (Abraham), and so, while

proportions of the Jewish Tabernacle,[1] are significant to the Christian philosopher (*γνωστικός*). Even the admission of Psalms into the Sacred Canon suggests the idea "of the harmony of the Law and the Prophets, of the Gospel and the Apostles, in the Church, and of that under-current of melody which flows on through all the changes of persons" (*τήν τε ὑποβεβηκυῖαν τὴν καθ' ἕκαστον προφήτην κατὰ τὰς μεταπηδήσεις τῶν προσώπων συνῳδίαν*). But "it would be a long task to go through all the details of the Law and the Prophets which are expressed in riddles, for almost the whole of Scripture speaks to us in this oracular language," yet most deeply and fully in the books of the new Covenant.

Str. vi. 11, 88.

Str. v. 6, § 32.

"The Saviour teaches His disciples nothing after a merely human fashion, but all things by a Divine and mystic wisdom;... for even those things which seem to have been expressed simply, still are found to require as much attention, nay, even more than what was spoken enigmatically, on account of the exceeding excess of meaning in them." His works[2] and words[3] alike convey ever-new lessons to those who search for them: hence it is necessary in reading Scripture to regard the general scope and the particular phrase, for "the careful distinction of words and facts produces great light in our souls, and we must needs listen attentively to those single expressions which convey many significations, and to the single signification of many words together." Thus, by the continual advances of Faith, we gain the mystical sense[4] of the Bible, while "the unwritten tradition of the written Word,[5] given by the Saviour Himself to the Apostles, is handed down even to us, being inscribed on new hearts according to the renewing of the Book by the power of God" (*κατὰ τὴν ἀνακαίνωσιν τοῦ βιβλίου*).

The Gospel. *de div. Salv.* § 5.

Str. vi. 10, § 82.

Str. vi. 15, § 131; *cf.* § 13.

he is still vigorous, he is induced to apply himself to worldly learning (the Egyptian Hagar), but afterwards she gives birth to a spontaneous truth (*τὸ αὐτομαθές*, Isaac). *Str.* I. 5, §§ 30, 31.

1 He gives a detailed explanation of the symbolism of the Tabernacle: *Str.* V. 6, 32 sqq. Thus the hangings which covered it indicated that its mysteries were veiled; the curtain over the *five* pillars (the five senses) represented the separation between the worlds of sense and reason; while the *four* pillars which divided the Holy of Holies from the Sanctuary, signified the four Covenants and the sacred Name of God.

2 Cf. *Str.* VI. 11, § 94.

3 Cf. *Str.* IV. 4, § 15.

4 Cf. fr. 66. *ὁ σωτὴρ τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἐδίδασκεν τὰ μὲν πρῶτα τυπικῶς καὶ μυστικῶς, τὰ δὲ ὕστερα παραβολικῶς καὶ ἡνιγμένως, τὰ δὲ τρίτα σαφῶς καὶ γυμνῶς καταμόνας.* Generally (Cf. *Str.* VI. 15, § 132) Clement only notices *two* senses of Scripture: in *Str.* I. 28, § 179, he appears to consider *three*.

It is a natural tradition which represents James and John and Peter as immediately instructed by our Lord after his Resurrection, and the others through them. Clem. Alex. ap. Euseb. *H. E.* II. 1, 3; cf. *Str.* VI. 8, § 68.

5 Cf. *Str.* VII. 17, § 106. This was the key (*κλείς*) of the true believer, while the misbeliever has a false key (*ἀντικλείς*).

This inner teaching Clement regards as useful for our moral training, and necessary from the nature and aim of Revelation. "The Scriptures conceal their meaning (ἐπικρύπτονται τὸν νοῦν) that we may be led to inquire from the commencement of our course, and be ever vigilant in the investigation of the words of salvation;"... "their character is figurative (παραβολικός), because the Lord, though He was not of the world (κοσμικός), came to men as if He were of the world, endued with every [human] virtue, and purposed to lead man — the foster-brother of the world — by the way of knowledge to pursue the intelligible and absolute, rising from a lower to a higher sphere" (ἔμελλεν τὸν σύντροφον τοῦ κόσμου ἄνθρωπον ἐπὶ τὰ νοητὰ καὶ κύρια δία τῆς γνώσεως ἀνάγειν ἐκ κόσμου εἰς κόσμον). Consequently "there are difficulties in the Bible, yet *all things*, we read (Prov. viii. 9), *are plain to those who understand*, that is, to all who receive and ever preserve the interpretation of the Scriptures, which has been made clear by Christ, according to the rule of the Church (ἐκκλεσιαστικὸς κανών), which consists in the perfect combination of all the notes and harmonies (συνφδία καὶ συμφονία) of the Law and the Prophets with the Testament[1] delivered at the presence of the Lord."

The use of this hidden meaning of Scripture. *Str. vi.* 15, § 126.

Str. vi. § 125.

2. Hitherto we have collected the scattered hints and implied assumptions of the plenary Inspiration of the Scriptures which are found in the works of the early Fathers of the Church; we have still a more difficult task before us in the examination of the direct arguments and definite conclusions of the great teacher of Alexandria — of him whose proper name is said to mean the "Son of Light," and whose labors earned for him the title of "Adamantine." The fortunes of Origen during his lifetime aptly prefigured the fate of his writings. His zeal was accounted infatuation, and his learning turned to a reproach. Though he was known to have reclaimed the wandering, and to have refuted the malicious, yet he was driven from the service of the Church in the very city where he had preached Christ on the steps of the Temple of Serapis, and strengthened his father to endure the terrors of martyrdom. Though "countless doctors, priests, and confessors" proceeded from his school, he was himself arraigned as a heretic and convicted; though he was the friend and teacher of saints,[2] his salvation was questioned and denied. For many centuries he was condemned almost universally by the Western Church, in consequence of the adverse judgment of Jerome. In later times Picus of Mirandola[3] ventured to maintain the cause of the great Father; the thesis was suppressed, but the

2. Origen.

1 Διαθήκη. Cf. *de Div. Serv.* § 3; Greg. Nyss. *ap. Suicer.* s. v. ἡ θεόπνευστος διαθήκη.

2 Gregory Thaumaturgus and Basil compiled the admirable selection of passages from Origen's writings on Holy Scripture, etc., which bears the title of *Philocalia*. Huet, *Origeniana*, I. 4, 10, gives a list of the pupils of Origen.

3 Huet, *Origeniana*, II. 4, 3, 19.

author remained uncensured; indeed, a pious lady was said to have received a revelation not long before, which seemed to assure her of the forgiveness of Samson, Solomon, and Origen. This hope, however, in the case of the last, was admitted apparently by few: and Baronius [1] expresses his surprise that any doubt of his condemnation could be raised after the sentence of Anastasius.

It is not our object now to enter at all into the general opinions and character of Origen: it will be enough for us to listen to his own words about Holy Scripture, and if we find in them a deep and solid foundation of truth constructed with earnestness and wisdom, — unaptly crowned, it may be, with the fantastic structures of a warm and hasty imagination, — it is possible that we may be led to regard his other labors with charity, if not with gratitude, and to remember that his errors refer to questions which had not in his time been decided by the authority of the Church.

General view of Inspiration.

The work "on Principles" (περὶ ἀρχῶν) which supplied the enemies of Origen with the richest store of objections, contains also the most complete view of his Theory of Inspiration. At the commencement of the first book he assumes the doctrine as acknowledged by all Christians, and in the last he supports it by a profound and independent proof, which in later times suggested the "Analogy" of Butler. "Truly," he says, "it is most evidently preached in the Churches that the Holy Spirit inspired each of the Saints, Prophets, and Apostles, and that the same Spirit was present in those of old time as in those who were inspired at the coming of Christ;" for "Christ, the Word of God, was in Moses and the Prophets,...and by His Spirit they spake and did all things." By the help of this illuminating Power the ministers of truth explained the hidden mysteries in the life and actions of man; unfolded the workings of God's Providence in Creation and Redemption; and, at the same time, edified the simple and unlearned by instructive narratives. The true God acted on the prophets to enlighten and strengthen them, and not to cloud or confuse their natural powers, like the Pythian Deity, who was akin to those dæmons which Christians are wont to drive out by prayers and adjurations; for the divine messengers "by the contact of the Holy Spirit with their soul (διὰ τῆς πρὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν ἁφῆς τοῦ καλουμένου ἁγίου πνεύματος), so to speak, gained a keener and a clearer intuition of spiritual truth" (διορατικώτεροι τὸν νοῦν [*Eth. Nic.* VI. 6] καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν λαμπρότεροι); and they thus became more perfect men as well as wiser seers.

de Princ. i. Præf. 4.

id. i. 1. *id. iv.* 15.

c. Cels. vii. 4.

Its presence in the whole of Scripture.

The details of the Cosmogony and the records of the chosen people were, in Origen's judgment, as truly written by the inspiration of Divine Wisdom as the works of the Prophets. He assumes that "the records of the Gospels are *oracles of the Lord, pure oracles as silver purified seven times in the fire*" (Ps. xii. 6), and that there is a meaning in their minutest

[1] Huet, *Origeniana*, II. 4, 3, 21.

details; while they are without error, inasmuch as we believe "that they were accurately written by the coöperation of the Holy Spirit". . . . The opening words of St. Luke's Gospel seem to him to prove and illustrate this doctrine of Inspiration: they "attempted" (ἐπεχείρησαν) to write histories who did so without the gift of God's grace (χωρὶς χαρίσματος); our Evangelists did not "attempt" that which they did by the motion of the Holy Spirit (ἔγραψαν ἐξ ἁγίου κινούμενοι πνεύματος), and their books only we receive on the authority of the Church of God. Yet more, Origen does not hesitate to say that the Christian receives the words of Paul as the words of God,[1] for he was made fit (ἱκανωθείς) to be a minister of the new Covenant, not of the letter, but of the spirit. They only, he elsewhere tells us, will find contradictions in the Apostle's writings "who sever the one doctrine of the Faith into the diverse opinions of sects, and examine only those testimonies of Scripture which support their peculiar view, regardless of the full and perfect meaning of such passages as exhibit the opposite side of the truth" (*e diverso veniunt*). But, again, he notices that St. Paul speaks some things in his own person which do not possess the same authority;[2] and he seems to consider that the inspiration of the Epistles generally is derived from the Gospels, for they are a Gospel in another form. Yet still they are not less pregnant in meaning than the other parts of Scripture, though to some they may seem more plain than the *historic* and prophetic books, but are full of the elements of the mightiest and most manifold thoughts. Such is the variety which we find in the Bible, yet all parts combine into one harmonious whole. "There are many sacred writings, yet there is but one Book: there are four Evangelists, yet their histories form but one Gospel:" they all conspire to one end, and move by one way. All the sacred volumes "breathe the Spirit of fulness, and there is nothing, whether in the Law or in the Prophets, in the Evangelists or in the Apostles (*sive in Evangelio sive in Apostolo*), which does not descend from the fulness of the Divine Majesty. Even at the present

de Princ. iv. 14.

In the Gospels. *in Matt. Tom. xv.* 8.

in Matt. Tom. xvi, 12.

Hom. i. in Luc.

In the Epistles.

Comm. in Joan. Tom. v. 3.

Comm. in Rom. Lib. iii. 7.

Comm. in Joan. Tom. i. v.

de Princ. iv. 10.

(*Dial.* § 1.)

Comm. in Joan. ii. p. 90. (*Huet.*)

Hom. in Jerem. xxi. 2.

1 Cf. *Hom.* VII. *in Levit.* § 4. Mihi autem sicut Deo et Domino nostro Jesu Christo ita et Apostolis ejus adhærere bonum est, et ex divinis scripturis secundum ipsorum traditionem intelligentiam capere.

2 His language at times seems inconsistent, unless we observe this distinction between the personal and general contents of the Epistles. For instance, he says of the "Epistle to Romans" (*Pref. in Ep. ad Rom.*): Videtur Apostolus in hac epistola perfectior fuisse quam in cæteris, quoting 1 Cor. ix. 27; Phil. iii. 10, 13. Again: Scribunt Thessalonicensibus *in verbo Dei* Paulus et Silvanus et Timotheus (Lib. III. fr.). Cf. *Hom.* II. *in Ezech.* I.; *Hom.* XXIX. *in Luc.; de Orat.* I. § 2.

time the words of fulness speak in Holy Scripture to those who have eyes to see the mysteries of heaven, and ears to hear the voice of God."

We may call the Gospel "the first-fruits of the Scriptures,"[1] or "the elements of the Faith of the Church;" we may believe that "the divinity of the prophetic revelations, and the spiritual meaning of the Law, shone forth by the dwelling of Jesus on earth," and that there were no clear proofs of the inspiration (*θεοπνεύστους*) of the writings of the old Covenant before that time; yet the Christian — who has recognized in his own Faith the fulfilment of Prophecy, and received the substance which the Law shadowed — will prize equally all "the words of God." "We cannot say of the writings of the Holy Spirit (*Spiritus Sanctæ litteræ*) that anything in them is otiose or superfluous, even if they seem to some obscure." We cannot believe that there is "one jot or tittle written in the Scriptures which does not work its own work, when men know how to employ it." The fault is our own if "the rock of stumbling" remain, for we shall indeed "find connection (*οὐδὲν παρέλκει*) and use in all that has been written, if we give heed to our reading, and pass over no letter without examination and inquiry." As in the natural world the skill of the Creator is not only seen in the stars of heaven, but in the organization and life of the meanest insect, and in the structure of the smallest plant, "so too we conceive of all that has been recorded by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost (*τὰ ἐξ ἐπιπνοίας τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἀναγεγραμμένα*), believing that the divine (*ἱερᾶς*) foreknowledge, which supplies superhuman wisdom to the race of man by the Scriptures (*διὰ τῶν γραμμάτων*), has placed, so to speak, the seeds of saving truths in each letter as far as possible; . . . at least whoever has once received these Scriptures as inspired by the Creator of the world, must expect to find in them all the difficulties which meet those who investigate the system of the universe."

All Scripture alike instructive.
Comm. in Joan. Tom. i. 6.
de Princ. iv. 6.

Hom. in Num. xxvii. 1.

Hom. xxxix. in Jerem. (Philoc. 10.)

Comm. in Ps. i. 4. (Philoc. 2.)

Origen rests his proof of Inspiration on the influence of the Sacred books, and the fulfilment of prophecy. Other legislators besides Moses, and other teachers besides Christ, he tells us, framed laws and systems which they would gladly have propagated through the world, but the Jewish[2] and Christian Creeds alone have spread successfully, in spite of national prejudices and religious persecution. Moreover, he adds, the rapidity with which Christian-

The proof of Inspiration.
de Princ. iv. 1.

[1] *Comm. in Joan.* I. 4. *χρὴν δ' ἡμᾶς εἰδέναι οὐ ταὐτὸν εἶναι ἀπαρχὴν καὶ πρωτογέννημα. Μετὰ γὰρ τοὺς πάντας καρποὺς ἀναφέρεται ἡ ἀπαρχή, πρὸ δὲ πάντων τὸ πρωτογέννημα.*

[2] *De Princip.* IV. 1 f. *Πᾶσα δὲ Ἑλλὰς καὶ βάρβαρος ἡ κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἡμῶν ζηλωτὰς ἔχει μυρίους, καταλιπόντας τοὺς πατρῴους νόμους καὶ νομιζομένους θεούς, τῆς τηρήσεως τῶν Μωσέως νόμως, καὶ τῆς μαθητείας τῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγων. . .*

ity was promulgated proves the divine nature of the Christian word,[1] "which is preached in the whole world so that Greeks and Barbarians, wise and foolish, profess the doctrines of our Faith." Again: the Law, the Psalms, and the Prophets, abound with predictions of the Advent and Reign of Christ, and foreshadow the desolation of Judah, and the assumption of the Gentile Church.[2] The fulfilment of these by the life of Jesus and the course of Christianity "has placed the Inspiration of the Scriptures beyond a doubt, and raised the veil from the face of Moses." Such are the outward proofs for the unbeliever; the Christian, however, will rest his faith on the teaching of the Church. The Bible is the bulwark of the Church, and the Church is its guardian. That alone is to be believed as truth which accords with the apostolic "tradition[3] handed down in the preaching of the Church, by order of succession from the Apostles, and even now abiding in the Churches."

de Princ. iv. 2.

de Princ. iv. 3–6.

de Princ. i. Pref. §§ 2, 3.

The objections which are urged against the doctrine of a plenary Inspiration Origen answers by analogies from Life, from Nature, and from Providence, as Irenæus,[4] in a more general way, had done before him. The anthropomorphic language of Scripture he compares with our own mode of addressing children, suitably to their understanding, to secure their benefit, and not to exhibit our own capacity (Deut. i. 31); though still for the spiritual it has also a spiritual meaning contained in the simple words, if we know how to hearken to them. Again: we have already seen that outward insignificance is no ground for disparaging the marvellous beauty of the least being in the natural creation; and the same holds true in the Bible. And thirdly, there are difficulties in the doctrine of Providence which we cannot yet solve, as, for instance, the existence of venomous animals, still we do not for this reason speak against the Author of nature, but wait, if haply we may be deemed worthy to know that about which we now reverently withhold our judgment; and so too in the divine Scriptures are many things which we cannot explain, and yet dare not condemn; but "as the doctrine of God's Providence is not destroyed (χρεωκοπεῖται) by our ignorance on particular points when we have once rightly admitted it, so likewise the divinity of the Scriptures, which extends through them all, remains undisturbed, though our weakness cannot in each special phrase master the hidden glory of the truths concealed under simple and contemptible language."[5]

Objections to the doctrine.

c. Cels. iv. 71.

Comm. in Ps. i. 4. (*Philoc.* 2.)

de Princ. iv. 7.

1 It is worth while remarking how absolutely Origen identifies the Christian *Books* and the Christian *Doctrine*.

2 The following are the prophecies which he quotes: Gen. xlix. 10; Hos. iii. 4; Deut. xxxii. 21; Ps. xlv. (xliv.) 1, 2; Ps. lxxii. (lxxi.) 7, 8; Isai. vii. 14; viii. 9; Mic. v. 2; Dan. ix. 24.

3 Cf. p. 422, n. 2.

4 Cf. p. 414.

5 When defending the rude style of the Scriptures upon the ground of their

We have already seen that Origen represents the doctrine of the Inspiration of the Bible as taught by the universal Church; in like manner he tells us that her principles of Interpretation were fixed, though there were variations in private judgment from the earliest times. "It is a point in her teaching that the Scriptures were written by the Spirit of God, and admit not only of the obvious meaning, but of another unperceived by many;[1] for those details which are written are the forms of certain mysteries and the images of divine things, and in this the opinion of the whole Church is one, that every part of the Law is spiritual."..."The simplest acknowledge the presence of these mystic dispensations,[2] and the most sagacious (*οἱ εὐγνώμονες καὶ ἄτυφοι*) confess that they do not understand them."

Interpretation. *c. Cels. iii.* 11. *de Princ. i. Pref.* § 8.

de Princ. iv. 9.

The peculiar feature of Origen's system of Interpretation is the maintenance of a threefold sense in Scripture generally; he finds indications of this principle in several passages of the Old Testament,[3] and maintains that as "man consists of body, soul, and spirit, so too does Holy Scripture, which has been granted by God for the salvation of man;"[4] and thus the simple may be edified by the *body* (*σῶμα*), the more advanced by the *soul* (*ψυχή*), and the perfect by the *spirit* (*πνεῦμα*). Cor-

A triple sense.

de Princ. iv. 14. *Hom. v. in Lev.* 5. *Hom. v. in Lev.* 1.

popularity, Origen adds (*c. Cels.* VI. 2): *ἐστὶ γοῦν ἰδεῖν τὸν μὲν Πλάτωνα ἐν χερσὶ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι φιλολόγων μόνον. τὸν δὲ Ἐπίκτητον καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν τυχόντων καὶ ῥοπὴν πρὸς τὸ ὠφελεῖσθαι ἐχόντων θαυμαζόμενον, αἰσθομένων τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ βελτιώσεως.* Any national literature would furnish a parallel.

1 This spiritual sense is granted by the Spirit to the Church. *Hom. in Lev.* v. 3.

2 The instances he quotes will best explain his meaning: Gen. xix. 30–38; Gen. xvi.; Gen. xxix.; Gen. xxx.

3 For instance, from the Mosaic history he refers to the construction of the Ark (the Church) "with lower, second, and third stories" (*Hom.* II. *in Gen.* § 6); from the Law, to Levit. vii. 9: Clibanus secundum sui formam profundiora . . . significat . . . Sartago ea quæ si frequenter versentur . . . explicari possunt. Craticula autem ea quæ palam sunt . . . (*Hom.* v. *in Lev.* 5), from the Proverbs, to Prov. xxii. 20, 21 (LXX.); and, again, from the Gospel, to the *three* loaves in the parable, Luke xi. 5, 6 (*Hom.* v. *in Levit.* § 5).

4 The threefold character of man's being, and its entire (*ὁλόκληρος*) consecration to God's service by Christianity, is clearly expressed in 1 Thess. v. 23. It is important to distinguish accurately between the principle of natural — intellectual — life (*ψυχή*), and that of spiritual — religious life (*πνεῦμα*). Divine revelation (*ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ*) sometimes by its mysteries leaves the one unsupported by the other (*μερισμὸς ψυχῆς τε καὶ πνεύματος.* Heb. iv. 12). Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 45; Phil. i. 27; Luke i. 47. Hence it is that *ψυχή* and *σάρξ* are never contrasted.

Those who gladly trace the earlier anticipations of truth will recognize this triple division in Plato, *Resp.* IV. pp. 441 sqq., where he distinguishes the appetitive (*τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν — σάρξ*), the emotional (*τὸ θυμοειδές — ψυχή*), and the rational (*τὸ λογιστικόν — πνεῦμα*) elements in a man and a state; and also in Aristotle's definition of a triple "essence" (*οὐσία*) — material (*ὕλη*),

responding to these three parts are three methods of Interpretation — the historical, the moral, and the mystical; and properly "the body" was for those who were before us, "the soul" for us, and "the spirit" for those "who shall receive the inheritance of eternal life, by which indeed they may reach the heavenly kingdoms."

The utility of the literal sense of Scripture "is proved by the multitudes of those who believe sincerely and simply;"[1] and the reality of the moral meaning is shown by the example of St. Paul (1 Cor. ix. 9 = Deut. xxv. 5), from which we may gather that Origen intends to include under this head the adaptation of the particulars of Scripture to the earthly life of *man*. "The spiritual explanation is that which shows the archetypes and substances imaged and shadowed in the Law;" and is found, by the teaching of the Apostles, to exist both in the ritual and in the historical books (1 Cor. x. 11; Gal. iv. 21—24; Heb. viii. 5; Rom. xi. 4). The "spiritual world," in which this interpretation is realized, may be regarded as heavenly, or as Christian and earthly:[2] when we contemplate the former, we explain "anagogically," and "allegories" properly are applied only to the latter. Thus, the prophecies which describe the character and fate of various nations under the Jewish dispensation may be referred, according to the one system (ἀναγωγή), to the inhabitants of the celestial regions correlative to the kingdoms on earth,[3] or by the other (ἀλλεγορία), to spiritual characters unfolded by Christianity.

The Literal, *de Princ. iv.* 12, *the* Moral, *de Princ. iv.* 13, *and the* Spiritual *sense, de Princ. iv.* 13.

de Princ. iv. 22.

We have now to inquire how far Origen refuses to acknowledge the literal sense in all cases: "Some Scriptures," he says, "have not the corporeal[4] (τὸ σωματικόν, *i. e., consequentiam historialis intelligentiæ*, as Rufinus renders it), so that in such cases we must seek alone the soul and the spirit." By this

Is the literal sense always true? de Princ. iv. 12.

formal (εἶδος), and the combination of these (τὸ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν), *De Animâ*, II. 2; and in his separation of the appetitive (ὀρεκτικόν), sensational (αἰσθητικόν), and rational (διανοητικόν), in human life: *De Animâ*, II. 3 (the other species of life — the nutritive (θρεπτικόν), and the translative (κινητικὸν κατὰ τόπον), — do not belong to this view). These systems are naturally distinguished from the scriptural teaching by their less distinct exhibition of the "spiritual" principle, which is absorbed in "reason."

1 Cf. *De Prin.* IV. 14. Προέκειτο γὰρ καὶ τὸ ἔνδυμα τῶν πνευματικῶν, λέγω δὲ τὸ σωματικὸν τῶν γραφῶν, ἐν πολλοῖς ποιῆσαι οὐκ ἀνωφελές, δυνάμενόν τε τοὺς πολλούς, ὡς χωροῦσι, βελτιοῦν.

2 So Guericke (*Hist. Scholæ Catech.* II. p. 60) rightly maintains against Mosheim and Rosenmüller.

3 In relation to this singular opinion compare Huet, *Origeniana*, II. 2, 11, 11: whatever Origen's error may be, it is clear that it arises from an extreme regard to the *letter* of Scripture.

4 *Hom.* II. *in Gen.* § 6. Non semper in Scripturis divinis historialis consequentia stare potest, sed nonnunquam verbi causâ deficit, ut Prov. xxvi. 9; 1 Regg. vi. 7; Lev. xiii.

Origen finds a symbol of the "*two or three*" meanings in John ii. 6 (*de Princ.* IV. 12).

he evidently means that certain passages, taken literally, do not *instruct* us, for no one can deny that they have a meaning. They may then be either untrue morally, or untrue historically; they may contain, in the letter, hurtful patterns, or symbolic narratives; let us examine Origen's opinion in relation to these two possible cases.

With regard to the first class of instances, no one would maintain that the moral failings of the patriarchs (Gen. ix., xx., xxxviii., which Origen quotes)[1] are objects for our direct imitation, and he himself asserts most strongly that the records are profitable in other ways. Again, we may include under this division those precepts of the Mosaic Law which are no longer needful for our moral training. These the Christian is to receive not literally, but spiritually; but though he does not value their outward sense, he is not therefore to cast them aside as worthless and worn out, but to seek for their inner significance.[2] Origen does not deny that the details of the Law were actuallly observed, but he maintains also that they are useful now.[3]

Morally? Stom. fr. Hom. in Gen. vi.

But in some places, it will be said, Origen denies the literal truth of facts. We have, indeed, already seen that he did not, as fanatics in those times as well as in our own, attribute passions to the Deity according to the letter of Scripture, but rather received its statements as true only in idea; and he carries out the same principle somewhat further; he denies that we ought to understand literally the account given of God "planting the garden of Paradise," and "walking in it in the cool of the evening."

Historically? de Princ. iv. 16.

1 Cf. *Hom.* VI. *in Gen.* § 1. Si quis hæc (Gen. xx.) secundum litteram *solum* audire vult et intelligere, magis cum Judæis quam cum Christianis debet habere auditorium. Origen does not deny the literal truth of the fact, but its moral fitness.

2 Cf. *Hom.* XI. *in Num.* § 1 f. Ostendimus, ut opinor, auctoritate Scripturæ divinæ ex iis quæ in lege scripta sunt aliqua penitus refugienda esse et cavenda, ne secundum litteram ab Evangelii discipulis observentur; quædam vero omnimode, ut scripta sunt, obtinenda, alia autem habere quidem secundum litteram veritatem sui, recipere tamen utiliter et necessario etiam allegoricum sensum. Cf. *Hom.* XI. *in Ex.* § 6; *Hom.* IX. *in Num.* § 4.

3 In some places he speaks of particular details of the Law as unreasonable (ἄλογα. *De Princ.* IV. 17) and impossible, if taken merely in their obvious sense: *e. g.*, Gen. xvii. 14; Exod. xvi. 29; Jer. xvii. 21, 22. We may also understand from this point of view his real meaning when he says that the law outwardly is "less elegant and reasonable than many human systems," and that "it may prove a stumbling-block without the Gospel;" but in that all its discords are resolved, or, in Origen's own beautiful words: When the people murmured in the wilderness Moses led them to the rock to drink, and even now he leadeth them to Christ (*Hom.* XI. *in Ex.* § 2).

The literal sense of some passages in the Gospels Origen holds to be similarly untenable: *e. g.*, Luke x. 4; Matt. x. 10; v. 39. Such examples show most distinctly the kind of error which he had to meet, and from which, indeed, he had himself suffered.

Yet more, he rejects that material theory of the Temptation which supposes that "all the kingdoms of the world were placed before the bodily eyes of Jesus, as contiguous to one mountain;" and adds that "whoever carefully examines the question will find countless similar incidents in the Gospels, not literally true [but true in idea], inwrought into those narratives which are to be received according to the letter."[1] If Origen had rested here it would have been an easy task to defend him, but in other places he speaks still more boldly. When discussing the apparent discrepancies of the Evangelists, he says that "if one were to set them all forth, then would he turn dizzy, and either desist from trying to establish all the Gospels in very truth, and attach himself to one,...or, admitting the four, grant that their truth does not lie in their corporeal forms" (*ἐν τοῖς σωματικοῖς χαρακτῆρσι*). But, at the same time, he only abandons the literal sense when he considers that it is self-contradictory, useless, or unworthy of God; he accepts all the Bible, and feels bound to give an intelligible reason for his faith:[2] he faces difficulties which many do not choose to see, and proposes a solution which only exhibits his veneration for Holy Scripture. Otherwise he admits the naked truth of the Patriarchal and Jewish history,[3] for "those things which are true historically are many more than those which contain merely a spiritual

Comm. in Joan. Tom. x. 2.

de Princ. iv. 19.

1 The Greek text stands as follows in Lommatzsch's edition: *παραπλησίως δὲ τούτοις καὶ ἄλλα μυρία ἀπὸ τῶν εὐαγγελίων ἔνεστι τὸν ἀκριβοῦντα τηρῆσαι, ὑπὲρ τοῦ συγκαταθέσθαι συνυφαίνεσθαι ταῖς κατὰ τὸ ῥητὸν γεγενημέναις ἱστορίαις, ἕτερα μὴ συμβεβηκότα.* One MS. omits *συνυφαίνεσθαι*, and it seems likely that the word is merely a gloss to explain *συγκαταθέσθαι*, which is generally used in a different sense: the comma after *ἱστορίαις* should be removed.

2 *Comm. Ser. in Matt.* § 134. Judicavi igitur bonum, ut accipiens bonum propositum eorum, qui in fide constantes esse desiderant, solutiones criminationum eorum, in quantum mihi ex Deo est virtus, inveniam pro evangelica veritate: ut fideles non solum fide simplici, sed etiam ratione fidei muniantur in fide.

Strauss (*Introd.* § 4) has endeavored to find a mythical tendency in the following beautiful passage: *καὶ τοῦτο προλαβόντες δι' ὅλην τὴν φερομένην ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἱστορίαν εἰρήκαμεν, οὐκ ἐπὶ ψιλὴν πίστιν καὶ ἄλογον τοὺς ἐντρεχεστέρους ἐκκαλούμενοι, ἀλλὰ βουλόμενοι παραστῆσαι, ὅτι εὐγνωμοσύνης χρεία τοῖς ἐντευξομένοις, καὶ πολλῆς ἐξετάσεως, καί, ἵν' οὕτως ὀνομάσω, εἰσόδου εἰς τὸ βούλημα τῶν γραψάντων, ἵν' εὑρεθῇ, ποίᾳ διανοίᾳ ἕκαστον γέγραπται. c. Cels.* I. § 42.

3 The Tenth Homily on Genesis is a good example of his method of dealing with such subjects. The passage referred to is quite sufficient to show that he admits the reality of Rebecca's history, though he maintains that the Holy Spirit had a deeper object in dictating the record: hæc fabulas putatis esse, et historias narrare in Scripturis Spiritum Sanctum (§ 2) for neither *fabula* nor *μῦθος* involve the falsity of the narrative which they convey. Cf. *Hom.* II. *in Ex.* § 1. Nos omnia quæ scripta sunt non pro narrationibus antiquitatum, sed pro disciplina et utilitate nostra didicimus scripta. . . *Hom.* I. *in Ex.* § 5. Non nobis hæc ad his-

sense;" he is unshaken in his belief in the most remarkable miracles,[1] and paints with force and feeling[2] the details of ancient events (*res gestæ*), that they may minister to our instruction; it is true that Christ ever opens the eyes of those who are mentally blind, but while on earth He restored to men their bodily sight: it is true that He ever raises the dead, but then He raised Lazarus from the grave; it is true that He ever stills the tempests in which the Church is tossed, when His disciples call upon Him, but then we know that He wrought the special work recorded in the Gospel history. Origen accepts the record — "for we know that all things which are written are true" — but he looks for something deeper; the question we have always to ask is, "What is the meaning of this relation" (*quo hæc tendit historia*)? for we cannot believe that it is "mere history, and does not pertain to us." The answer to this inquiry must be sought by careful and laborious criticism. In Origen's judgment, we must insist on the strict interpretation of tenses and persons,[3] and find a meaning in phrases which are commonly held to be vague conventionalities;[4] we must not omit an article,[5] nor neglect an antithesis;[6] for the fulness of our spiritual insight will be proportioned to the distinctness of our historical conception — the inward and the outward are so combined that we must proceed to the one by the other.

Frag. in Ep. ad Gal.

Hom. xvii. in Luc.
Hom. v. in Luc.
Hom. xxxviii. in Luc.

From the passages which we have quoted it will appear that Origen's errors lie rather in the application of his theory than in the theory itself; many of our greatest expositors unconsciously adopt his separate principles, but all, probably, would shrink back from imitating the haste and boldness of his deductions. Yet it

Errors in detail.

toriam scripta sunt, neque putandum est libros divinos Ægyptiorum gesta narrare, sed quæ scripta sunt ad nostram doctrinam et commonitionem scripta sunt. . . . *Hom.* IX. *in Jos.* § 7, Hæc quidem veterum historiæ referunt gesta: sed quomodo nos hanc historiæ narrationem ad mysticam intelligentiam referemus? . . .

1 For instance, in the history of Balaam. *Hom.* XIII. *in Num.* § 8.

2 Cf. *Hom.* IX. *in Num.* § 5.

3 Cf. *Comm. Ser. in Matt.* § 25; where he accepts the remarkable tradition which identifies "Zacharias the son of Barachias" with the father of John the Baptist, from the form "ye slew" (Matt. xxiii. 30). Cf. Thilo, *Cod. Apocr.* Prol. 64. See also *Hom.* X. *in Luc.* (Luke i. 76). *Comm. in Matt.* Tom. XIII. f. Matt. xvi. 19 (οἱ οὐρανοί), compared with Matt. xviii. 18 (ὁ οὐρανός).

4 *Hom.* XV. *in Gen.* § 1. Si diligentius consideremus, inveniemus quia nunquam fere in sanctum quis locum dicitur descendisse, neque ad vituperabilem conscendisse memoratur. Cf. *Hom.* XX. *in Luc.* Crebro descendit Jesus cum discipulis . . . nec absque fine sublimia tenet. *Hom. in Josh.* II. 3.

So again (*Hom.* III. *in Luc.*) in Luke i. 11, he finds in the word "appeared" a law of spiritual phenomena: [eorum] quæ sunt divina et superna in voluntate est videri et non videri. Cf. *Hom.* IX. *in Luc.* (Luke i. 57). Ubicunque justus nascitur ibi complentur dies.

5 *Hom.* XXXV. *in Luc.* (Luke xii. 58).

6 *Hom.* VIII. *in Luc.* (Luke i. 46: ψυχή — μεγαλύνει, πνεῦμα — ἀγαλλιάζεται).

must be remembered that when he first investigated the question of Scripture Interpretation, it was governed by no laws, and limited rather by custom than by reason. The Alexandrine school of Philo had long endeavored to rescue the Law, by any means, from the contempt of Philosophy; the teachers of the Christian Church had received certain models of exposition in the New Testament, and sought to reproduce their form without determining the basis of their construction. But Origen went further: he was dissatisfied with the inheritance of Jewish allegories and Christian imitations, and sought to determine afresh the true system of Biblical Criticism; he did not indeed decline the arduous labors of a scholar for the more pleasing speculations of a commentator; but while he laid down deep and striking laws of Interpretation, he revised the text of Scripture with singular ingenuity and zeal. He felt that there was something more than a mere outward form in the Bible; he felt that the "words of God" must have an eternal significance,[1] for all that comes into relation with God is eternal; he felt that there is a true development and a real growth in the elements of Divine Revelation;[2] he felt the power and glory of the Spirit of Scripture bursting forth from every part; and can we wonder that he sometimes failed to notice the fair symmetry and perfect proportions of its framework? Can we condemn him for gazing too earnestly where we are unwilling to turn our eyes? Can we reject his entire system because it has been misapplied by others or by himself? It is not our purpose now to estimate the intrinsic merits of his scheme, or the extent to which he failed in using it, yet we may call to mind that the founder of modern Philosophy not only laid down the principles of knowledge, but also endeavored to employ them; and it may be as unfair to disparage the symbolic interpretation of Scripture by Origen's errors in detail, as to judge of the capabilities of Inductive Science from Bacon's "Theory of Heat."

Matt. xxii. 32.

It only remains for us now to refer to Origen's view of the personal use of the Scriptures, which is too noble not to claim some slight notice. We must read them, he tells us, "with attention, yea, with great attention, for it is needed in reading the divine writings, that we may not speak or form notions about them rashly." We must read them with reverence: "for if we use great care in handling the Sacred Elements, and rightly so, is it a less offence (*piaculum*) to disregard the Word of God than His Body?" We must read them with

The Study of Scripture.

Ep. ad Greg. § 3.

Hom. xiii. in Ex. § 3.

1 *Hom.* IX. *in Num.* § 7. Reconditum in iis (ss. Scripturis) invenies et secretum mysteriorum sapientiæ et scientiæ Dei sensum, quo nutriantur et pascantur animæ sanctorum non solum in præsenti vita sed etiam in futura.

2 *Hom.* I. *in Ex.* § 1. Videtur mihi unusquisque sermo divinæ Scripturæ similis esse alicui seminum, cujus natura hæc est, ut cum jactum fuerit in terram regeneratum in spicam vel in quamcunque aliam sui generis speciem, multipliciter diffundatur, et tanto cumulatius quanto vel peritus agricola plus seminibus laboris impenderit vel beneficium terræ fœcundius indulserit...

pure hearts: for "no one can listen to the Word of God . . . . . unless he be holy in body and spirit; . . . . . no one can enter into this feast with soiled garments." Yet "the mere language of the Bible is not enough to reach the soul of man, unless power be given from God to the reader, and shed its influence (ἐπανθεῖν) over the lesson;[1] for, if there are oracles of God in the Law and the Prophets, in the Gospels and Apostles, he who is a student (μαθητευόμενος) of God's oracles must place himself under the teaching of God" (δεήσει . . . . . διδάσκαλον ἐπιγράφεσθαι θεόν); such a one must "seek their meaning by inquiry, discussion, examination, and, which is greatest, by prayer;[2] "he must not be content to 'knock' and to 'seek,' for prayer is the most necessary qualification for the understanding of divine things, ... and the Saviour urged us to this when he said, not only 'knock, and it shall be opened,' 'seek, and ye shall find,' but also, 'ask, and it shall be given you.'" If, then, we read the Bible with patience, prayer, and faith; if we ever strive after a more perfect knowledge, and yet remain content in some things to know only in part, even as Prophets and Apostles, Saints and Angels, attain not to an understanding of all things, — our patience will be rewarded, our prayer answered, and our faith increased.[3] So "let us not weary in reading the Scriptures which we do not understand, but let it be unto us according to our faith, by which we believe that all Scripture, being inspired by God (θεόπνευστος οὖσα), is profitable." "Oftentimes we derive good without perceiving it, for thus our life is supported; . . . . . so, too, our spiritual life is frequently profited by the mere reading of Scripture, when our reason does not receive the fruit: a charm, as it were, acts upon our nature; its better elements are strengthened and matured, the worse weakened and brought to nought."

Hom. xi. in Ex. § 7. *c. Cels. vi.* § 2. *Hom. in Jer. x.* § 1. *Hom. in Gen. xi.* 3. *de Princ. iv.* 26. *Hom. xx. in Jos.*

SECT. VII. — THE CLEMENTINES.

THE CLEMENTINES.

There is yet one group of writings, stamped in common with the name and authority of Clement of Rome, which requires some notice. Of this the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions are the most important representatives, which do not, I believe, yield in intellectual interest to any production of the

1 Cf. *de Princ.* IV. 10. Κἂν ἐπὶ τὰ εὐαγγέλια δὲ φθάσωμεν, κἀκείνων ὁ ἀκριβὴς νοῦς, ἅτε νοῦς ὢν Χριστοῦ, δεῖται χάριτος τῆς δοθείσης τῷ εἰρηκότι· ἡμεῖς δὲ νοῦν Χριστοῦ ἔχομεν (1 Cor. ii. 12).

2 *Hom.* XII. *in Ex.* § 4. Non solum studium adhibendum est ad discendas litteras sacras, verum et supplicandum Domino, et diebus et noctibus obsecrandum, ut veniat Agnus ex tribu Juda, et ipse accipiens librum signatum dignetur aperire.

3 *Hom.* VII. *in Luc.* Utinam mihi eveniat ut ab infidelibus stultus dicar qui talibus credidi. Such are Origen's words when contemplating the great mystery of Christianity.

first three centuries.[1] Both works present the same great outlines. Both give a history of the conflict between "the chief of the Apostles," St. Peter, and the great enemy of the first age, Simon Magus. But under this general likeness they offer considerable differences in detail and theological tendency. The Homilies are distinctly Ebionite and anti-Pauline, while the Recognitions present a view of the Person of our Lord intermediate between the opinions of Artemon and Arius.[2] The value of the Clementines does not, however, lie in the system of doctrine which they contain, for in this respect they are often confused and contradictory, but in a singular richness of thought and speculation. In reading them we seem to stand face to face with some old speculator who tries at one time to bring Christianity within the measure of his philosophy, and then again to solve former difficulties by Christian truth. Questions which we regard commonly as the growth of a later age are debated with subtle ingenuity. The "scepticism" of the first century is found to have been scarcely less powerful or less pregnant than that of our own.

Their importance as recognizing a sceptical element in the first ages.

The existence of this speculative element in the early Church, hidden too often under the name of Gnosticism, is of the greatest importance for estimating rightly the growth of Christianity in the face of an able and thoughtful opposition; and the form of teaching to which it led is scarcely less interesting as a phase of mental culture. But without entering on these wider relations of the Clementines, we must confine ourselves to the light which they throw on the primitive idea of Inspiration. On this subject the Homilies and the Recognitions present points of difference which correspond with the fundamental differences of the two books, and both alike offer a striking contrast to the broad comprehensiveness of the Catholic doctrine which has been already traced in the fathers of the Church.

i. The Homilies.

The Homilies — and in this they only present a common error in a bolder form — regard Inspiration only in relation to the Prophet, and not to the Church. The individual overpowers the society: he at once conveys the message and interprets it. In this partial view the Homilies support the opposite extreme to Montanism. The Montanists regarded an ecstasy — a suspension of man's natural facilities — as the necessary mark of a divine teacher, but in the Homilies we read that "the Spirit must be innate and perpetual" (ἔμφυτον καὶ ἀέννααν), and that the revelation must be distinctly conceived in the Prophet's consciousness, for partial knowledge and temporary possession "belong to those who are maddened by

Hom. iii. 12.

1 For the general history of the Clementines, the works of Schliemann (*Die Clementinen. . .* Hamb. 1844) and Uhlhorn (*Die Homilien und Recognitionem d. Klem. Rom. . .* Göttingen, 1854) give all that can be required. Of the Homilies, Dressel's edition (Gött. 1853) is the best; of the Recognitions, the small text of Gersdorf (Lips. 1838) the most accessible.

2 Schliemann, 533 ff.; 330 ff.

the spirits of disorder, and intoxicated by the reeking of altars." The true Prophet, with boundless spiritual intuition (*ἀπείρῳ ψυχῆς ὀφθαλμῷ*), sees and knows all things, mental and material (*πάντα πάντοτε . . . πάθη, τόπους, ὅρους*), by an immediate and perfect knowledge, without the agency of dreams and visions; for those influences are uncertain and no mark of piety, while the Prophet must be sure and sinless, — they are independent of the exercise of reason, while his power works through his soul. Such prophets were Adam, Moses, and Christ, who appear in clear preëminence above all other men, and next to them stand Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.[1] Till the coming of Christ the Pentateuch — in its pure form — was the depository of Truth, for the later Prophets were inspired by the secondary power, typified by Eve, through which the divine element was involved in human corruptions.

Hom. iii. 13.
id.
Hom. xvii. 15-17.
Hom. ii. 6.
Hom. xvii. 14.
Hom. iii. 23, 25.

In one remarkable passage Peter is represented as declaring the nature of Revelation from his own experience, at the time when he received the blessing of the Lord. "The answer rose in my heart: I know not how I said, 'Thou art the Son of the living God;' . . . and from that time I learnt that to learn without teaching, or vision, or dream, is Revelation. And truly it is so; for in that [truth] which is placed in us of God all truth is contained seminally (*σπερματικῶς*), and is covered and revealed by the hand of God, who worketh in us according to the merit (*ἀξίαν*) of each; but that anything should be manifested from without, by visions or dreams, is clearly not an instance of Revelation, but of wrath." Though in this case the Apostle is made to claim the privilege of a direct communication with God, in other places he declines the title of Prophet: "I am a servant of God, the Creator of all things," he says; "a disciple of His right (*δεξίου*) Prophet; wherefore being His Apostle I speak the truth;" and again, "I am a disciple of the true Prophet, and not a Prophet."

Matt. xvi. 16, 17.
Hom. xvii. 18.
Hom. vii. 11.
Hom. xviii. 7.

With these subjective views of the prophetic office the writer of the Homilies does not hesitate to maintain the unauthenticity of the Mosaic writings. According to him, the Law was first given orally by the Prophet to the seventy elders and afterwards reduced to writing, when the devil was permitted to introduce errors[2] into its form, that the hearts of its readers might be

Hom. ii. 38; iii. 4; 47.

1 The seven Old Testament Prophets are called by the author of the Homilies the "seven pillars of the world" (*Hom.* xviii. 13, 14). Cf. Schliemann, 194 ff.; Uhlhorn, 164 ff.

2 The errors which are enumerated in the Clementines are partly the anthropomorphic descriptions of God's anger, jealousy, repentance, etc. (*Hom* ii. 43); and partly the moral failings of the Patriarchs. It is worth while to recall the method by which Origen removed these difficulties. See above, p. 436. Schliemann (197, *anm.*) scarcely does justice to the great Christian Father.

tried; yet this doctrine of the corruption of the Pentateuch is only for the advanced Christians, and not for the simple and unlearned. The fitness of the Bible to prove the faith of man is beautifully described: "There are many representations of the Deity in the Scriptures, . . . and each finds in them that idea of God which he wishes. Moreover, our soul within is arrayed for immortality in His image; if, then, I leave Him who gave it the likeness, the likeness justly will leave me." . . Thus the right discrimination of the truth of the Scriptures must rest in the internal witness of the believer's heart, who should be, after his Lord's command, "a good money-changer,"[1] skilful to discern the true image of the Divine and the current counterfeit.

Hom. xvi. 10.

Hom. iii. 50.

"The Recognitions" differs in its whole doctrinal tendency from the Homilies, though it was undoubtedly based upon them. In this book Christianity is no longer regarded as identical with pure Judaism, nor are the Prophets degraded into the ministers of a corrupt power; and though the full majesty of the Saviour is still unrecognized, He is raised above the ancient Lawgiver. Consistently with this view of the two economies, the author of the Recognitions declares the harmony of the Law, the Histories, and the Prophets;[2] and, at the same time, he places the source and the proof of their Inspiration in Jesus. The difficulties which beset the understanding of the Scriptures are not attributed to the outward corruptions of an evil spirit, but to the "sin which has grown up with (*coadolevit*) men;" so that the truth is not referred to the judgment of the personal consciousness, but drawn from the tradition of the appointed teachers in the Church.

ii. The Recognitions.

Recog. i. 69.

Recog. ii. 48; *i.* 59.

Recog. i. 21.

Recog. ii. 45, 55.

Yet more, The Recognitions differs from the Homilies in the view which it gives of the mode, the extent, and the instruments of Divine Revelation. In the Homilies we read that dreams and visions are marks of God's wrath, but in the Recognitions it is said that He has condescended to address men by such outward agencies; and the objective glories of the Mosaic Law — "the heavenly voices and visions of Sinai" — are distinctly acknowledged. The importance of this difference will be more apparent when we remember that the call of St. Paul[3] to his Christian mission was made by a glorious appearance of the Lord, who further instructed the future Apostle of the Gentiles by visions in Arabia, Jerusalem, and Paradise. In another place the

Recog. iv. 21.

1 *Hom.* II. 51: εὐλόγως ὁ διδάσκαλος ἡμῶν ἔλεγεν· γίνεσθε τραπεζῖται δόκιμοι. Cf. Cotelerius, l. c.; *Inf.* p. 425.

2 Thus quotations from the Psalms are introduced with the following words: Sancti Spiritu Dei repleti, et guttis misericordiæ ejus irrorati exclamabant (*Recog.* II. 44).

In another place we read: Imagines gestorum Moysi et ante ipsum patriarchæ Jacob, ipsius (veri prophetæ) per omnia typum ferebant (*Recog.* v. 10).

3 For this remark I am indebted to Schliemann, 312.

whole circle of natural acquirements is included by the author of the Recognitions in the gifts of the Apostolate: Peter is described "as a man of God, full of all knowledge (*plenus totius scientiæ*), acquainted even with Greek learning, because he is filled with the Spirit of God;" though, indeed, such empty eloquence (*loquacitas*) was unsuited to the dignity of one who rightly spake of heavenly things.[1]

Recog. viii. 5.

For the Christian has another and an abiding source of wisdom in the presence of "the true Prophet," who teaches him according to his needs. This "true Prophet," even Christ, is the one illuminator of the soul. He is the sole author of all perception of the divine and the eternal. He alone knows all the past, the present, and the future. The whole existence of the world is but as the course through which He hastens to rest. He taught the patriarchs, and in each generation was present to the good, though under a veil, especially to those who looked for Him. The progress of history was in some sense a preparation for His Incarnation, which was the most powerful charm to win the love of men. And when He died "all the world suffered with Him: for the sun was darkened, and the mountains were rent asunder, and the graves were opened, and the veil of the temple was torn, as if in sorrow for the destruction which was coming upon the place."[2]

Recog. ii. 22.
Recog. i. 16.
Recog. i. 21.
Recog. ii. 22.
Recog. i. 52.

Recog. i. 60.
Recog. i. 54.

The general effect of the inquiry into the early doctrine of "Inspiration of Scripture," which is now completed, is to confirm in the fullest degree the results which were obtained independently from a consideration of the idea of a written record of a Divine revelation. The unanimity of the early Fathers in their views on Holy Scripture is the more remarkable when it is taken in connection with the great differences of character, and training, and circumstances by which they were distinguished. In the midst of errors of judgment and errors of detail, they maintain firmly, with one consent, the great principles which invest the Bible with an interest most special and most universal, with the characteristics of the most vivid individuality and of the most varied application. They teach us that inspiration is an operation of the Holy Spirit acting *through* men, according to the laws of their constitution, which is not neutralized by His influence, but adopted as a vehicle for the full expression of the Divine Message. They teach us that it is generally combined with the moral progress and purification of the teacher, so that there is on the whole a moral fitness in the relation of the prophet to the doctrine. They teach us that Christ — the Word of God — speaks from first to last; that all Scripture is permanently fitted for our instruction; that a true spiritual meaning, eternal and absolute, lies beneath historical and ceremonial and moral details. They teach us that this view was in their time no late invention, but a

1 Schliemann, 311. 2 Cf. Uhlhorn, 234.

tradition which they received and transmitted, each according to his skill endeavoring to carry out the principles which he had learnt. It is possible that objections, more or less serious, may be urged against various parts of the doctrine, but it cannot, I think, be denied that as a whole it lays open a view of the Bible which vindicates with the greatest clearness and consistency the claims which it makes to be considered as one harmonious message of God, spoken "in many parts and many manners" *by* men and *to* men — the distinct lessons of individual ages reaching from one time to all time. If it be false, we shall then be bound to inquire earnestly what are the grounds, the proofs, the limits of our own belief; if it be true, we shall certainly be led to prize the Scriptures more highly and more personally, as inexhaustible wells of living water, ever springing up unto eternal life.

Verum hæc per excessum quendam, rei tamen ipsius consequentia commonitos breviter dixisse sufficiat ad ostendendum id quod sunt quædam quorum significatio proprie nullis omnino potest humanæ linguæ sermonibus explicari, sed simpliciore magis intellectu, quam ullis verborum proprietatibus declarantur. Ad quam regulam etiam divinarum Scripturarum intelligentia retinenda est, quo scilicet ea quæ dicuntur non pro vilitate sermonis sed pro divinitate Sancti Spiritus qui eas conscribi inspiravit, censeantur.

Orig. de Princ. *iv. 27.*

APPENDIX C.

ON THE APOCRYPHAL TRADITIONS OF THE LORD'S WORDS AND WORKS.

Συναγάγετε τὰ περισσεύσαντα κλάσματα ἵνα μή τι ἀπόληται. — St. John, vi. 12.

It is a fact of great significance, that traditional accounts of words or works of the Lord which are not noticed in the Gospels are extremely rare. The Gospels are the full measure of what was known in the Apostolic age, and (may we not add?) of what was designed by Providence for the instruction of after-ages. There are, however, some fragments which appear to contain true and original traits of the Lord's teaching, and as such are invested with the greatest interest. Some traditional sayings, again, are evidently duplicate recensions of passages contained in the Gospels. Others are so distorted by the admixture of explanation or comment as to present only a very narrow point of connection with the Evangelic history. The following collection of these various kinds of traditional sayings is as complete

Apocryphal traditions very scanty.

as I have been able to make it, but may probably still admit of additions. The first saying is stamped with the authority of St. Paul, and cannot, therefore, be called apocryphal, but it is too important a supplement to the records of the Gospel to be passed over in an account of "unwritten words."[1]

1. Traditional words.
(a) Original traditions.

1. . . . Remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how He said, *It is more blessed to give than to receive* (Acts xx. 35).[2] Compare Luke vi. 30. The saying does not appear, so far as I know, elsewhere.

2. On the same day, having seen one working on the Sabbath, He said to him, *O man, if indeed thou knowest what thou doest, thou art blessed; but if thou knowest not thou art cursed, and art a transgressor of the law.*[3]

3. *But ye seek to increase from little, and from greater to be less.*[4] Cf. John v. 44.

4. The Son of God says, *Let us resist all iniquity, and hold it in hatred.*[5]

5. Thus He [Christ] saith, *They who wish to see me and to lay hold on my kingdom must receive me by affliction and suffering.*[6] Cf. Matt. xvi. 24; Acts xiv. 22.

1 I have been unable to obtain Koerner, *De dictis Christi ἀγράφοις*, 1776. The collection by Bunsen, *Anal. Ante-Nic.* I. 29 ff. is very imperfect. On the other hand, that of Anger (*Synops. Evang.* quoted before) is, as far as he goes, very complete.

2 . . . *μνημονεύειν τῶν λόγων τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν, Μακάριόν ἐστιν μᾶλλον διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν.*

3 This very remarkable narrative occurs in Cod. D, after Luke vi. 4: *τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ θεασάμενός τινα ἐργαζόμενον τῷ σαββάτῳ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἄνθρωπε, εἰ μὲν οἶδας τί ποιεῖς μακάριος εἶ· εἰ δέ μὴ οἶδας ἐπικατάρατος καὶ παραβάτης εἶ τοῦ νόμου.* The form of address (*ἄνθρ.*) occurs Luke xii. 14; *ἐπικατάρατος* occurs John vii. 47; *παραβάτης νόμου* is a phrase of St. Paul. It is evident that the saying rests on some real incident; but it does nor recur elsewhere.

Other additions which occur in D seem to be only new versions of passages in the Gospels. The most remarkable are:

After § 3, Matt. xx. 28, *εἰσερχόμενοι δὲ καὶ παρακληθέντες δειπνῆσαι μὴ ἀνακλίνεσθαι (ἀνακλίνεσθε) εἰς τοὺς ἐξέχοντας τόπους, μήποτε ἐνδοξότερός σου ἐπέλθῃ, καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ δειπνοκλήτωρ εἴπῃ σοι. Ἔτι κάτω χώρει, καὶ καταισχυνθήσῃ· ἐὰν δὲ ἀναπέσῃς εἰς τὸν ἥττονα τόπον καὶ ἐπέλθῃ σου ἥττων, ἐρεῖ σοι ὁ δειπνοκλήτωρ Σύναγε ἔτι ἄνω, καὶ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο χρῆσιμον.*

John vi. 56: *καθὼς ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατὴρ κἀγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρί. ἀμήν, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ λάβητε τὸ σῶμα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὡς τὸν ἄρτον τῆς ζωῆς οὐκ ἔχετε ζωὴν ἐν αὐτῷ.* The same passage occurs in some Latin authorities.

4 Cod. D, and *it. pler.* after Matt. xx. 28: *ὑμεῖς δὲ ζητεῖτε ἐκ μικροῦ αὐξῆσαι καὶ ἐκ μείζονος ἔλαττον εἶναι.* This striking sentence is variously rendered by the Latin MSS. It seems to be a genuine fragment. The phrase *ἔλαττον εἶναι* is very remarkable.

5 Barn. *Ep.* 4. . . dicit filius Dei: *Resistamus omni iniquitati et odio habeamus eam.*

The passage quoted by Barnabas, c. 6, *ἴδου, ποιήσω τὰ ἔσχατα ὡς τὰ πρῶτα*, seems to be a mixture of Ezek. xxxvi. 11 and Matt. xix. 30.

6 Barn. *Ep.* 7: *οὕτως, φησίν, οἱ*

6. *Show yourselves tried money-changers.*[1] Cf. 1 Thess. v. 21.

7. *He that wonders shall reign; and he that reigns shall rest.*[2] *Look with wonder at that which is before you.*[3]

8. *I came to put an end to sacrifices, and unless ye cease from sacrificing* [*God's*] *anger will not cease from you.*[4] Cf. Matt. ix. 13.

9. Jesus said to His disciples, *Ask great things, and the small shall be added unto you; and ask heavenly things, and the earthly shall be added unto you.*[5] Cf. Matt. vi. 33.

10. Our Lord Jesus Christ said, *In whatsoever I may find you, in this will I also judge you.*[6] *Such as I may find thee, I will judge thee,* saith the Lord.[7]

11. The Saviour Himself says, *He who is near me is near the fire; he who is far from me is far from the kingdom.*[8] Cf. Luke xii. 49.

θέλοντές με ἰδεῖν καὶ ἅψασθαί μου τῆς βασιλείας ὀφείλουσι θλιβόντες καὶ παθόντες λαβεῖν με.

[1] Γίνεσθε τραπεζῖται δόκιμοι. Apelles ap. *Epiph.* 44, 2; Orig. *in Joann.* XIX. etc.; cf. Anger, p. 274. This is the most commonly quoted of all apocryphal sayings, and seems to be genuine. The thought is explained in an addition to the parable of the Talents which occurs in the Clementine Homilies, Σοῦ γάρ, φησὶν [ὁ Κύριος], ἄνθρωπε, τοὺς λόγους μου ὡς ἀργύριον ἐπὶ τραπεζιτῶν καὶ ὡς χρήματα δοκιμάσαι (*Clem. Hom.* III. 61).

2 Ex *Ev. Hebr.* ap. Clem. Al. *Strom.* II. 9, § 45: Ὁ θαυμάσας βασιλεύσει καὶ ὁ βασιλεύσας ἀναπαυθήσεται.

3 *Trad. Matt.* ap. Clem. Al. *Strom.* II. 9, § 45: θαύμασον τὰ παρόντα βαθμὸν τοῦτον πρῶτον τῆς ἐπέκεινα γνώσεως ὑποθέμενος.

4 *Ev. Ebion.* ap. Epiph. *Hær.* XXX. 16, p. 140: Ἦλθον καταλῦσαι τὰς θυσίας, καὶ ἐὰν μὴ παύσησθε τοῦ θύειν οὐ παύσεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἡ ὀργή.

5 Orig. *de Orat.* § 2: εἶπε γὰρ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ Αἰτεῖτε τὰ μεγάλα καὶ τὰ μικρὰ ὑμῖν προστεθήσεται, καὶ αἰτεῖτε τὰ ἐπουράνια καὶ τὰ ἐπίγεια προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν. Cf. Clem. *Str.* I. 24, § 158: αἰτεῖσθε γάρ, φησί, τὰ μεγάλα καὶ τὰ μικρὰ ὑμῖν προστεθήσεται. Id. *Strom.* IV. 6, § 34.

6 Just. M. *Dial.* 47: ὁ ἡμέτερος Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εἶπεν· Ἐν οἷς ἂν ὑμᾶς καταλάβω, ἐν τούτοις καὶ κρινῶ. Clem. Al. *Quis dives,* § 40: Ἐφ' οἷς γὰρ ἂν εὕρω ὑμᾶς, φησίν, ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ κρινῶ.

7 Nilus ap. Anast. Sin. *Quæst.* 4 (Anger, p. 207): οἷον γὰρ [ἂν] εὕρω σε, τοιοῦτόν σε κρινῶ, φησὶν ὁ Κύριος.

8 Orig. *Hom. in Jerem.* III. p. 778: Legi alicubi quasi Salvatore dicente, et quæro sive quis personam figurarit Salvatoris, sive in memoriam adduxerit, ac verum sit hoc quod dictum est. Ait autem ipse Salvator: *Qui juxta me est, juxta ignem est; qui longe a me longe est a regno.*

Didymus, *in Ps.* 88, 8: διὸ φησὶν ὁ Σωτήρ Ὁ ἐγγύς μου ἐγγὺς τοῦ πυρός· ὁ δὲ μακρὰν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ μακρὰν ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας.

For the knowledge of this remarkable saying I am indebted to the Rev. F. J. A. Hort.

A very similar phrase occurs in Ignatius (*ad Smyrn.* 4): ἐγγὺς μαχαίρας ἐγγὺς θεοῦ· μεταξὺ μαχαίρας μεταξὺ θεοῦ; and both phrases offer some resemblance to one quoted from the Doctrine of Peter by Gregory Naz. (*Ep.* I. *ad. Cæs.* ap. Credn. *Beitr.*

12. The Lord says in the Gospel, *If ye kept not that which is small, who will give you that which is great? For I say unto you, that he that is faithful in very little is faithful also in much.*[1] Cf. Luke xvi. 11, 12, 10 (the last clause coincides verbally).

13. [The Lord] says, *Keep the flesh pure and the seal unspotted,* that we may receive eternal life (perhaps *that ye may receive eternal life.*)[2]

14. The Lord Himself having been asked by some one, When His kingdom will come? said, *When the two shall be one, and that which is without as that which is within, and the male with the female neither male nor female.*[3] Cf. Gal. iii. 28.

15. Jesus says, *For those that are sick I was sick, and for those that hunger I suffered hunger, and for those that thirst I suffered thirst.*[4] Cf. Matt. xxv. 35, 36 (ἐπείνασα, ἐδίψησα, ἠσθένησα).

16. . . . In the Hebrew Gospel we find the Lord saying to His disciples, *Never be joyful except when ye shall look on your brother in love.*[5]

1. 353): κάμνουσα ψυχὴ ἐγγύς ἐστι θεοῦ.

1 [Clem. Rom.] *Ep.* II. 8: λέγει γὰρ ὁ Κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ Εἰ τὸ μικρὸν οὐκ ἐτηρήσατε, τὸ μέγα τίς ὑμῖν δώσει; λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ πιστὸς κ.τ.λ.

This form of the thought occurs again in Irenæus (II. 34, 3): *Si in modico fideles non fuistis, quod magnum est quis dabit vobis?*

2 [Clem. Rom.] *Ep.* II. 8: ἆρα οὖν λέγει, Τηρήσατε τὴν σάρκα ἁγνὴν καὶ τὴν σφραγῖδα ἄσπιλον, ἵνα τὴν αἰώνιον ζωὴν ἀπολάβωμεν (-ητε?).

3 [Clem. Rom.] *Ep.* II. 12: ἐπερωτηθείς . . . αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος ὑπό τινος πότε ἥξει αὐτοῦ ἡ βασιλεία, εἶπεν Ὅταν ἔσται τὰ δύο ἓν καὶ τὸ ἔξω ὡς τὸ ἔσω καὶ τὸ ἄρσεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας οὔτε ἄρσεν οὔτε θῆλυ. This mystical saying, which seems very different in form from the character of our Lord's words, is found in Clement of Alexandria in several shapes. *Strom* III 9, §§ 63 ff.: φασὶ γὰρ ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν ὁ Σωτήρ Ἦλθον καταλῦσαι τὰ ἔργα τῆς θηλείας . . ἡ Σαλώμη φησί Μέχρι τίνος οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀποθανοῦνται; . . . ὁ Κύριος ἀποκρίνεται Μέχρις ἂν τίκτωσιν αἱ γυναῖκες . . Καλῶς οὖν ἐποίησα μὴ τεκοῦσα . . . ἀμείβεται ὁ Κύριος Πᾶσαν φάγε βοτάνην τὴν δὲ πικρίαν ἔχουσαν μὴ φάγῃς . . *Id.* 13, § 92: πυνθανομένης τῆς Σαλώμης πότε γνωσθήσεται τὰ περὶ ὧν ἤρετο, ἔφη ὁ Κύριος Ὅταν τὸ τῆς αἰσχύνης ἔνδυμα πατήσητε, καὶ ὅταν γένηται τὰ δύο ἓν καὶ τὸ ἄῤῥεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας οὔτε ἄῤῥεν οὔτε θῆλυ. Clement believes, he says, that the narrative was contained in the Gospel according to the Egyptians.

A passage of Pseudo-Linus (*De Passione Petri*), for which I am indebted to Baron Bunsen (*Anal. Ante-Nic.* I. p. 31), appears to contain another version of this saying: Dominus in mysterio dixerat, *Si non feceritis dextram sicut sinistram et sinistram sicut dextram et quæ sursum sicut deorsum et quæ ante sicut retro non cognoscitis regnum Dei.*

A good instance of the mixture of a mystic explanation with a simple text occurs in a passage of the Πίστις Σοφία, quoted by Tischendorf, *on Matt.* XXIV. 22.

4 Orig *In Matt.* Tom. XIII. 2: Ἰησοῦς γοῦν φησί Διὰ τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας ἠσθένουν, καὶ διὰ τοὺς πεινῶντας ἐπείνων, καὶ διὰ τοὺς διψῶντας ἐδίψων. The words appear to be only an adaptation of the passage in St. Matthew.

5 Hieron. *in Eph.* v. 3: in Hebraico. . . . Evangelio legimus Dominum ad

17. . . . When the Lord came to Peter and the Apostles [after His resurrection], He said to them, *Take hold, handle me, and see that I am not an incorporeal spirit.* And straightway they touched Him and believed, being convinced by His flesh and by His Spirit.[1]

18. Christ said: *Good must needs come, but blessed is he through whom it comes.*[2]

19. It was not through unwillingness to impart His blessings that the Lord announced in some Gospel or other: *My mystery is for me and for the sons of my house.* We remember our Lord and Master, how he said to us: *Keep my mysteries for me and for the sons of my house.*[3]

20. The cause, therefore, of the divisions of soul that came to pass in houses [Christ] Himself taught, as we have found in a place in the Gospel

discipulos loquentem: *Et nunquam*, inquit, *læti sitis, nisi quum fratrem vestrum videritis in caritate.*

In another place (*adv. Pelag.* III. 2) Jerome has preserved from the same source a version of Matt. xviii. 22 . . . (Luke xvii. 4), differing from the canonical text: *Si peccaverit*, inquit, *frater tuus in verbo et satis tibi fecerit, septies in die suscipe eum.* Dixit illi Simon discipulus ejus: Septies in die? Respondit Dominus et dixit ei: *Etiam ego dico tibi, usque septuagies septies. Etenim in prophetis quoque, postquam uncti sunt Spiritu Sancto, inventus est sermo peccati.* The Greek text of this passage has been given by Tischendorf from the margin of one of his new MSS. (*Notitia*, etc., p. 58), as taken from τὸ Ἰουδαϊκόν. But the Greek does not remove the obscurity of the last clause. Τὸ Ἰουδαϊκὸν ἑξῆς, ἔχει μετὰ τὸ ἑβδομηκοντάκις ἑπτά· καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς προφήταις μετὰ τὸ χρισθῆναι, αὐτὸς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, εὑρίσκεται ἐν αὐτοῖς λόγος ἁμαρτίας (ad Matt. xviii. 22). The MS. contains other varieties of reading, from the same source, on Matt. iv. 5; xvi. 17; xxvi. 74, which all tend to show the close connection of the apocryphal and canonical texts.

Jerome again refers to the saying given in the text in *Comm. in Ezech.* VI., XVIII. 7, . . . in Evangelio quod juxta Hebræos Nazaræi legere consueverunt, inter maxima ponitur crimina, qui fratris sui spiritum contristaverit.

1 Ignat. *ad Smyrn.* 3: . . . ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν, ἔφη αὐτοῖς. Λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον. Καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτοῦ ἥψαντο καὶ ἐπίστευσαν, κρατηθέντες τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι.

The same words are quoted by Jerome from the Nazarene Gospel, *De. Vir. Illustr.* 16: *Ecce palpate me et videte quia non sum dæmonium incorporeum.* Cf. Hieron. *In Isai.* Lib. XVIII. *Prol.* The chief clause occurred also in the Doctrine of Peter: *Non sum dæmonium incorporeum* (Orig. *de Princ.* Præf. 8). Cf. Euseb. *H. E.* III. 36.

2 *Clem. Hom.* XII. 29: ἔφη Τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἐλθεῖν δεῖ· μακάριος δέ, φησίν, δι' οὗ ἔρχεται. The other sayings which occur in the Homilies (III. 55): ὁ πονηρός ἐστιν ὁ πειράζων. XIX. 2: Μὴ δότε πρόφασιν τῷ πονηρῷ, etc., seem less likely to be genuine.

3 Clem. Alex. *Strom.* V. 10, § 64: οὐ γὰρ φθονῶν, φησί, παρήγγειλεν ὁ Κύριος ἔν τινι εὐαγγελίῳ, Μυστήριον ἐμὸν ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ οἴκου μου. *Clem. Hom.* XIX. 20: Μεμνήμεθα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ διδασκάλου ὡς ἐντελλόμενος εἶπεν ἡμῖν Τὰ μυστήρια ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ οἴκου μου φυλάξατε.

existing among the Jews in the Hebrew language, in which it is said: *I will select to myself these things* (ܐܓܒܐ ܠܝ) : *very very excellent are those whom my Father who is in heaven has given to me.*[1]

21. . . . . The Lord taught of those days [of His future kingdom on earth] and said: *The days will come in which vines shall spring up, each having ten thousand stocks, and on each stock ten thousand branches, and on each branch ten thousand shoots, and on each shoot ten thousand bunches, and on each bunch ten thousand grapes, and each grape when pressed shall give five and twenty measures of wine. And when any saint shall have seized one bunch, another shall cry: I am a better bunch; take me; through me bless the Lord.* Likewise also [He said], that a grain of wheat shall produce ten thousand ears of corn, and each grain ten pounds of fine pure flour; and so all other fruits and seeds and each herb according to its proper nature. And that all animals, using for food what is received from the earth, shall live in peace and concord with one another, subject to men with all subjection. . . . . And he [Papias] added, saying: Now these things are credible to them which believe. And when Judas the traitor believed not and asked: How then shall such productions proceed from the Lord? the Lord said, *They shall see who shall come to these times.* Of this then (Irenæus adds) Isaiah prophesied, Isai. xi. 6 ff.[2]. . . . .

(*b*) *Variations of Evangelic words.*

In addition to these passages, which seem to contain in a more or less altered form traces of words of our Lord, there are other fragments which are either variations of known sayings, or (as it appears) sentences framed to suit the character of the apocryphal work in which they were found. Of these fragments the following are the most remarkable:

1. The Lord said: *Should you be with me gathered in my bosom, and not do my commandments, I will cast you off, and say to you, Go from me, I know you not whence you are, workers of iniquity.*[3] Cf. Matt. vii. 21–23.

2. The Lord saith: *Ye shall be lambs in the midst of wolves.* But Peter answers Him, and saith: What, then, should the wolves tear in pieces the lambs? Jesus said to Peter: *Let not the lambs fear the wolves after they are dead; and do you fear not those who kill you and can do nothing to you;*

1 Eusebius, *Theophania*, IV. 13 (p. 234, Prof. Lee's *Translation*). This quotation seems to have been unnoticed.

2 Papias, cf. Iren. v. 33, 3. It is evident that this famous passage gives only a very imperfect representation of the discourse of the Lord to which it refers, for I think that it is certainly based on a real discourse. It must be observed that the narrative is now only preserved in a Latin translation of a free quotation from Papias, who gave it on the authority of those who had heard St. John speak of teaching of the Lord to such effect. The history of the tradition is a sufficient explanation of the corruption which it has suffered.

3 [Clem. Rom.] II. 4: . . . εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος Ἐὰν ἦτε μετ' ἐμοῦ συνηγμένοι ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ μου, καὶ μὴ ποιῆτε τὰς ἐντολάς μου, ἀποβαλῶ ὑμᾶς. καὶ ἐρῶ ὑμῖν Ὑπάγετε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς ποθεν ἔστε, ἐργάται ἀνομίας.

but fear Him who after you are dead hath power over soul and body, to cast them into hell-fire.[1] Cf. Matt. x. 16, 28; Luke xii. 4, 5.

3. In the Preaching of Peter the Lord says to the disciples after the Resurrection: *I chose out you twelve disciples, having judged you worthy of me.*[2] Cf. John vi. 70; xv. 16.

4. Peter says that the Lord said to the Apostles: *Should then any one of Israel be willing to repent, so as to believe upon God through my name, his sins shall be forgiven him. After twelve years go out into the world, lest any one say, "We did not hear."* [3]

5. . . . According to some who alter the Gospels [Christ says]: *Blessed are they who have been persecuted through righteousness, for they shall be perfect; and blessed are they who have been persecuted for my sake, for they shall have a place where they shall not be persecuted.*[4] Cf. Matt. v. 10.

6. . . . The Word says to us: *Should any one for this reason kiss* [a woman] *a second time because she pleased him* [he sins]; and adds, *Men must therefore act thus with extreme caution in the kiss* [of peace] (or rather the salutation), *as knowing that, if perchance it should be sullied by thought, it would place them out of the pale of eternal life.*[5]

7. . . . [In the Gospel according to the Hebrews] the Saviour Himself says: *Just now my Mother, the Holy Spirit, took me by one of my hairs, and bore me away to the great mountain, Thabor.*[6]

1 Clem. Rom. II. 5: Λέγει γὰρ ὁ Κύριος Ἔσεσθε ὡς ἀρνία ἐν μέσῳ λύκων. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος αὐτῷ λέγει Ἐὰν οὖν διασπαράξωσιν οἱ λύκοι τὰ ἀρνία; Εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ Πέτρῳ Μὴ φοβείσθωσαν τὰ ἀρνία τοὺς λύκους μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτά· καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ φοβεῖσθε τοὺς ἀποκτείνοντας ὑμᾶς καὶ μηδὲν δυναμένους ποιεῖν· ἀλλὰ φοβεῖσθε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν ὑμᾶς ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος, τοῦ βαλεῖν εἰς γέενναν πυρός.

2 Clem. Al. *Strom.* VI. § 48: ἐν τῷ Πέτρου Κηρύγματι ὁ Κύριός φησι πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν Ἐξελεξάμην ὑμας δώδεκα μαθητάς, κρίνας ἀξίους ἐμοῦ.

3 Clem. Al. *Strom.* VI. § 43: διὰ τοῦτο φησὶν ὁ Πέτρος εἰρηκέναι τὸν Κύριον τοῖς ἀποστόλοις Ἐὰν μὲν οὖν τις θελήσῃ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ μετανοῆσαι διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματός μου [τοῦ] πιστεύειν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, ἀφεθήσονται αὐτῷ αἱ ἁμαρτίαι· μετὰ δώδεκα [δ'] ἔτη ἐξέλθετε εἰς τὸν κόσμον μή τις εἴπῃ οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν.

4 Clem. Al. *Strom.* IV. § 41: ὥς τινες τῶν μετατιθέντων τὰ εὐαγγέλια Μακάριοι, φησίν, οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ὑπὸ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἔσονται τέλειοι. καὶ μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκα ἐμοῦ ὅτι ἔξουσι τόπον ὅπου οὐ διωχθήσονται.

5 Athenag. *Legat.* 33: . . . ἡμῖν λέγοντος τοῦ λόγου Ἐάν τις διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ δευτέρου καταφιλήσῃ ὅτι ἥρεσεν αὐτῷ — καὶ ἐπιφέροντος Οὕτως οὖν ἀκριβώσασθαι τὸ φίλημα (μᾶλλον δὲ τὸ προσκύνημα) δεῖ, ὡς εἴπου μικρὸν τῇ διανοίᾳ παραδολωσθείη, ἔξω ἡμᾶς τῆς αἰωνίου τιθέντος ζωῆς.

6 This very singular saying, which is evidently of *Hebrew* origin, from the gender of *Spirit* (*Ruach*), is quoted several times. Orig. *In Joann.* Tom. II. § 6 f.: Ἐὰν δὲ προσίεταί τις τὸ κατ'

8. [Christ] said: *Many shall come in my name. . . .* And, *There shall be schisms and heresies.* And, *Take heed to false prophets.*[1] . . .

9. [It is said] in Scripture: *The just shall fall seven times, and shall rise again.*[2] Cf. Luke xvii. 4.

10. It is said in the Gospel according to Luke: *He to whom more is forgiven loves more; and he to whom less is forgiven loves little.*[3] Cf. Luke vii. 47.

11. [Christ said] *I often desired to hear one of these words, and had not one to tell me.*[4]

2. Traditional facts.

The traditional facts relative to the Gospel history, which present the slightest semblance of truth, are even fewer than the traditional words. Justin Martyr gives some details which appear to be mere deductions from the received history, or translations of prophecy into history. Such are the notices that the mother of the Lord was of *the family of David*, that the Lord

Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον, ἔνθα αὐτὸς ὁ Σωτὴρ φησιν ἄρτι ἔλαβέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ἐν μιᾷ τῶν τριχῶν μου, καὶ ἀπήνεγκέ με εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ μέγα Θαβώρ. Id. *Hom. in Jerem.* xv. 4: εἰ δέ τις παραδέχεται τὸ ἄρτι ἔλαβε με, κ.τ.λ. Hieron. *In Mich.* vii. 6: . . . qui . . . crediderit Evangelio quod secundum Hebræos editum nuper transtulimus, in quo ex persona Salvatoris dicitur *Modo tulit me mater mea, Sanctus Spiritus, in uno capillorum meorum*. . . Id. *In Isai.* xv. 11: . . . in Evangelio quod juxta Hebræos scriptum Nazaræi lectitant, Dominus loquitur *Modo me tulit*, etc. Id. *In Ezech.* xvi. 13: In Evangelio Hebræorum quod lectitant Nazaræi, Salvator inducitur loquens *Modo me arripuit mater mea, Spiritus Sanctus.* Cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.* 361, n.; Bp. Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 166.

1 Just. M. *Dial*, § 35, p. 253 B: εἶπε γάρ . . . . Ἔσονται σχίσματα καὶ αἱρέσεις. This sentence seems to have been formed from the sense of our Lord's words and the form of 1 Cor. xi. 18, 19. It occurs in a transitional shape in *Clem. Hom.* xvi. 21. Justin, however, quotes it as an independent saying.

The passage quoted by Hegesippus (Phot. *Cod.* 232, p. 472; *Fragm.* ap. Routh, i. p. 219) seems to be only a citation from memory of Matt. xiii. 16. See also Tischdf. *ad* Matt. vii. 22.

The words quoted by Origen from Celsus (*c. Cels.* viii. 15, 16) do not seem to make any pretensions to being words of the Lord (Anger, p. xxvii. n). The whole passage is extremely obscure.

2 [Hipp.] *adv. Hær.* (Naass.) v. 7, p. 102: τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ εἰρημένον, φησίν, ἐν τῇ γραφῇ Ἑπτάκις πεσεῖται ὁ δίκαιος καὶ ἀναστήσεται.

3 Cypr. *Test.* iii. 116: In Evangelio cata Lucam Cui plus dimittitur, plus diligit; et cui minus [pusillum] dimittiur, modicum diligit. Cf. Iren. iii. 20, 2.

To these passages may be added the clause appended by D, and numerous Latin authorities, to Mark xiii. 2: καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλος ἀναστήσεται ἄνευ χειρῶν. Compare also p. 424, n. 3.

4 Marcos. ap. Iren. i. 20, 2: . . . ἐν τῷ εἰρηκέναι Πολλάκις ἐπεθύμησα ἀκοῦσαι ἕνα τῶν λόγων τούτων καὶ οὐκ ἔσχον τὸν ἐροῦντα. I think that ἐπεθύμησα was an early corruption for ἐπεθύμησαν, and that the reference is to Matt. xiii. 17. Ἐπεθύμησα seems to be inconsistent with the context.

was born in *a cave*, that the wise men came from *Arabia*, that the Lord's miracles were attributed to *magic*, that the ass which the disciples brought for Him was found *tied to a vine*.[1] Of a similar kind are the statements made by Celsus, that the person of the Lord was "little and ill-favored (δυσειδές) and ignoble," and that His mother wrought with her own hands;[2] and those which occur in the Clementines, that John the Baptist (like the Moon) had thirty disciples, as our Lord (the Sun) had twelve,[3] and that the ministry of Christ began at the spring solstice.[4] Some traditions had a wider currency, though they may have had a like origin, as that the Baptism was accompanied by the appearance of a bright fire or light, and the words, "Thou art my Son: *This day have I begotten Thee.*"[5] One, which appears in many different forms, represents our Lord as commanding His disciples to remain for twelve years at Jerusalem;[6] another relates that He remained with them eighteen months after the Resurrection,[7] and gave fresh revelations which were preserved in esoteric books. The tendency to exaggeration appears in the story of the death of Judas given on the authority of Papias; and, since it is as natural to define as to exaggerate, names were affixed to many of the chief persons who are nameless in the Gospel history.[8] Of the domestic life of the Lord one trait only, except such as are obviously fabulous,[9] has been preserved, which from its simplicity may be true, where Justin says that "ploughs and yokes were preserved, which Christ wrought while among men."[10] Some details are added to narratives of the Gospels, as in the notice that "the man with a withered hand" was a mason, and that a "vast lintel of the Temple" was shattered by the earthquake at the Crucifixion; but the history of the appearance of the Lord to St. James is the only independent record of a fact known to have taken place which is not mentioned in the Gospels.[11]

Yet cf. Luc. i. 27.

i. Cor. xv. 7.

1 Just. M. *Dial.* 43, 78, 69.

2 Cels. ap. Orig. *c. Cels.* VI. 75; I. 28.

3 *Clem. Hom.* II. 23.

4 *Clem. Hom.* I. 6 f.

5 Cf. p. 435, n. 2; p. 438.

6 Clem. Al. *Strom.* VI. § 43: . . . μετὰ δώδεκα ἔτη ἐξέλθετε εἰς τὸν κόσμον μὴ τὶς εἴπῃ Οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν. Cf. Apollon. ap. Euseb. *H. E.* V. 18 (ὡς ἐκ παραδόσεως). The Πίστις Σοφία (Anger, p. xliii.) gives eleven (?) years.

7 Valentiniani ap. Iren. I. 3, 2.

8 Examples of this appear in the Versions of the Gospels. Thus the two thieves are called in Matt. xxvii. 38, 39, *Zoatham* and *Camma;* in Mark xv. 27, *Zoathan* and *Chammatha*, by *Colb. Par.;* and in Luke xxiii. 32, *Joathas* and *Maggatras*, by *Rhedig.* In Luke xxiv 13, the name *Emmaus* by a variety of changes is made to serve as the name of one of the disciples.

Compare also *Hom. Clem.* II. 19, Ἰούστα τις ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστὶν Συροφοινίκισσα, κ. τ. λ. (Matt. xv. 22). Even the Rich man in Luke (xvi. 19) receives a name: *Nineve* (*Sahid.* and *Schol. Gr.*).

9 The famous story of the Alphabet may deserve notice from the early date at which it was current: Iren. I. 20, 1. Cf. Thilo, *Cod. Apocr.* p. 290 ff. Other early legends occur in Justin, *Gnost.* ap. [Hippol.] *Philos.* V. p. 156.

10 Just. M. *Dial.* c. 88.

11 All these examples are taken from the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, Cf. pp. 435 f.

One of the early additions to the last

APPENDIX D.

ON SOME OF THE APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

Καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ. — 2 Cor. ii. 17.

The acts and sayings attributed to the Lord, which have been preserved elsewhere than by the Evangelists, have been already noticed: it still remains for us to collect the materials which illustrate the general character and contents of those early writings which for a time partially occupied the place or disputed the claims of the canonical Gospels. As might have been anticipated, these "apocryphal Gospels" present two great types, one Judaizing, the other Pauline. The former type is preserved in several specific forms which correspond to differences in the Judaizing sects — *The Gospel according to the Hebrews* (i), *The Ebionite Gospel* (ii), *The Clementine Gospel* (iii): the latter in *The Gospel of Marcion* (iv). It would carry us away from our immediate subject to discuss how far the first three Gospels are to be regarded as having a distinct existence as written records, but I cannot but believe that too little weight is allowed ordinarily to the power of oral tradition to mould and propagate modified forms of isolated passages. The fragments themselves will show on what a narrow basis many ingenious theories have been built. One point, however, seems beyond all reasonable doubt, that the synoptic Gospels give a simpler and therefore an earlier form of the common narratives. This follows at once from a general view of the fragments; and argument of detail would be of little avail against a critic who could maintain that the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* or the *Gospel of Marcion* are respectively the originals of St. Matthew and St. Luke.

I. The Gospel according to the Hebrews (τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον. Clem. Alex.; Orig. Evangelium secundum (juxta) Hebræos. Hieron.).

Several passages of this Gospel have been already quoted, for which a simple reference is sufficient: the remaining fragments are given at length.

1. Cf. p. 449, *num.* 17.
2. Cf. p. 447, *num.* 7.
3. Cf. p. 451, *num.* 7.
4. Cf. p. 448, *n.* 5.
5. Cf. p. 448, *num.* 16.
6. Cf. p. 449, *num.* 20.

chapter of St. Mark deserves notice from its singularity. It is preserved by Jerome: In quibusdam exemplaribus et maxime in Græcis codicibus juxta Marcum in fine ejus Evangelii scribitur: Postea cum occubuissent undecim, apparuit eis Jesus et exprobravit incredulitatem et duritiam cordis eorum, quia his qui viderant eum resurgentem non crediderunt (Marc. xvi. 14). Et illi satisfaciebant dicentes: Sæculum istud iniquitatis et incredulitatis substantia est (one MS. *sub Satana est*), quæ non sinit per immundos spiritus veram Dei apprehendi virtutem: idcirco jam nunc revela justitiam tuam (*Adv. Pelag.* ii. § 15).

7. The Gospel contained a history of "*a woman who was accused of many sins before the Lord,*" which was related also by Papias.[1]

8. It is written in a Gospel, which is styled "according to the Hebrews," if any pleases to receive it, not as an authority, but as an illustration of the subject before us. *Another rich man said to Him, Master, what good thing shall I do to live? He said to him, Fulfil the law and the prophets. He answered Him, I have fulfilled them. He said to him, Go, sell all that thou possessest, and distribute to the poor, and come, follow me. But the rich man began to scratch his head, and it did not please him. And the Lord said to him, How sayest thou, I have fulfilled the law and the prophets, since it is written in the law, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself; and lo! many of thy brethren, sons of Abraham, are clothed in filth, dying of hunger; and thy house is full of many goods, and nothing at all goes out of it to them? And He turned and said to Simon His disciple, who was sitting by Him, Simon, son of Jonas, it is easier for a camel to enter the eye of a needle than for a rich man* [*to enter*] *into the kingdom of heaven.*[2]

9. The Gospel entitled "according to the Hebrews," which I lately translated into Greek and Latin, and which Origen often quotes, contains the following narrative after the Resurrection. *Now the Lord, when He had given the cloth to the servant of the priest, went to James and appeared to him. For James had taken an oath that he would not eat bread from that hour on which he had drunk the cup of the Lord, till he saw Him risen from the dead.* Again, a little afterwards, the Lord says, *Bring a table and bread.* Immediately, it is added, *He took bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave it to James the Just, and said to him, My brother, eat thy bread, for the Son of Man has risen from the dead.*[3]

10. In the Gospel according to the Hebrews . . . there is the following passage: *So, the mother of the Lord and His brethren said to Him: John the Baptist is baptizing for the remission of sins; let us go and be baptized by*

1 Euseb. *H. E.* III. 39: ἐκτέθειται δὲ [ὁ Παπίας] καὶ ἄλλην ἱστορίαν περὶ γυναικὸς ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἁμαρτίαις διαβληθείσης (*de muliere adultera*, Ruf.) ἐπὶ τοῦ κυρίου, ἣν τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον περιέχει. There is no reason to suppose that Papias derived the history from the Hebrew Gospel, and not from tradition. The narrative *may* (as Rufinus implies) be the same as the pericope, John viii. 1–11. Cf. Fabricius, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.* p. 356 n.

2 This passage is given in the Latin version (not by Rufinus. Cf. Huet, *Origeniana*, III. 3, 12) of Origen's commentary on St. Matthew (Tom. XVI. § 14). The passage is not found in any Greek MS. The text is printed by Tischendorf on Matt. xix. 16.

3 Hieron. *de Vir. Illustr.* II.: Evangelium quoque quod appellatur *secundum Hebræos*, et a me nuper in Græcum Latinumque sermonem translatum est, quo et Origenes sæpe utitur, post resurrectionem Salvatoris refert: *Dominus autem cum dedisset sindonem servo sacerdotis, ivit ad Jacobum et apparuit ei. Juraverat enim Jacobus se non comesturum panem ab illa hora qua biberat calicem Domini, donec videret eum resurgentem a dormientibus* (Gr. ἀναστάντα ἐκ νεκρῶν). Rursusque post paullulum: *Afferte*, ait Dominus, *mensam et panem.* Statimque additur: *Tulit panem et benedixit ac fregit et dedit Jacobo justo, et dixit ei: Frater mi, comede panem tuum, quia resurrexit Filius hominis a dormientibus.*

him. But He said to them: What sin have I committed that I should go and be baptized by him? unless perchance this very word which I have spoken is [*a sin of*] *ignorance.*[1]

11. According to the Gospel written in Hebrew which the Nazarenes used (it is said): *The Holy Spirit with full stream shall come down upon Him* (the branch of Jesse) . . . . Moreover, in the Gospel of which I made mention above, we find this written: *Now it came to pass when the Lord had come up out of the water, the Holy Spirit with full stream came down and rested upon Him, and said to Him: My Son, in all the prophets I was waiting for Thee, that thou shouldest come, and I might rest in Thee. For Thou art my rest; Thou art my Firstborn Son, who reignest forever.*[2]

12. *Bethlehem of Judæa* . . . this is an error of the copyist: for I think that the word given originally by the Evangelist, as we read in the Hebrew, was *Judah*, not *Judæa*.[3]

13. In the Gospel entitled *according to the Hebrews* for *panis supersubstantialis* (of the Latin version, Matt. vi. 11), I found *mahar*, which means *for the morrow*.[4]

14. In the Gospel which the Nazarenes and Ebionites use, which I

1 Hieron. *adv. Pelag.* III. 2: In Evangelio *juxta Hebræos*, quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone sed Hebraicis litteris scriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni *secundum Apostolos*, sive, ut plerique autumant, *juxta Matthæum*, quod et in Cæsariensi habetur bibliotheca, narrat historia: *Ecce Mater Domini et fratres ejus dicebant ei: Joannes Baptista baptizat in remissionem peccatorum; eamus et baptizemur ab eo. Dixit autem eis; Quid peccavi ut vadam et baptizer ab eo? nisi forte hoc ipsum quod dixi ignorantia est.* Et in eodem volumine: *Si peccaverit*, inquit, *frater tuus in verbo*, etc. (cf. p. 427 *n.*).

This narrative was found also in the *Preaching of Paul* (or *of Peter*, or *of Peter and Paul*): . . . in quo libro contra omnes scripturas et de peccato proprio confitentem invenies Christum, qui solus omnino nihil deliquit, et ad accipiendum Joannis baptisma pæne invitum a matre sua Maria esse compulsum. Item cum baptizaretur ignem super aquam esse visum, quod in Evangelio nullo est scriptum . . . (Auct. *De Rebaptismate*, c. XVII.).

I have not noticed any passage in which the mention of a light at the Baptism is referred to the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, though the circumstance was described in the Ebionite Gospel.

2 Hieron. *Comm. in Isai.* IV. XI. 2: . . . Juxta Evangelium quod Hebræo sermone conscriptum legunt Nazaræi: *Descendit super eum omnis fons Spiritus Sancti* . . . Porro in Evangelio, cujus supra fecimus mentionem, hæc scripta reperimus: *Factum est autem cum ascendisset Dominus de aqua, descendit fons omnis Spiritus Sancti et requievit super eum et dixit illi: Fili mi, in omnibus prophetis expectabam te, ut venires et requiescerem in te. Tu es enim requies mea; tu es filius meus primogenitus qui regnas in sempiternum.*

3 Hieron. *ad Matt.* II. 5: *Bethlehem Judææ* . . . Librariorum hic error est. Putamus enim ab Evangelista primum editum, sicut in ipso Hebraico legimus, *Judæ* non *Judææ*.

4 Hieron. *ad Matt.* VI. 11: In Evangelio quod appellatur secundum Hebræos pro *supersubstantiali* pane reperi *Mahar*, quod dicitur *crastinum*; ut sit sensus: *Panem nostrum crastinum* (id est *futurum*) *da nobis hodie.*

lately translated from the Hebrew into Greek, and which is called by very many the original Gospel of Matthew, the man with the withered hand is described as a mason, who sought the help (of Christ) with words to this effect: *I was a mason, seeking a livelihood by the labor of my hands. I pray Thee, Jesus, to restore to me my health, that I may not beg my bread in disgrace.*[1]

15. In the Gospel used by the Nazarenes I find *the son of Jehoida* for *the son of Barachias.*[2]

16. The name Barabbas is interpreted in the Gospel styled *according to the Hebrews* as *Son of their master.*[3] . . . .

17. In the Gospel of which I have often made mention, we read that *a lintel of the Temple of vast size was broken asunder.*[4]

II. The Gospel of the Ebionites.

Epiphanius speaks of the Nazarenes as "having the Gospel according to Matthew in a most complete form, in Hebrew," though he immediately adds that he does not know whether "they removed the genealogies from Abraham to Christ."[5] In contrast with this statement he says that the Ebionites had a Gospel "called the Gospel according to Matthew, not entire and perfectly complete, but falsified and mutilated, which they call the Hebrew Gospel."[6] He then gives several passages professedly taken

1 Hieron. *ad Matt.* XII. 13: In Evangelio quo utuntur Nazaræni et Ebionitæ, quod nuper in Græcum de Hebræo sermone transtulimus, et quod vocatur a plerisque Matthæi authenticum, homo iste qui aridam habet manum, cæmentarius scribitur, istiusmodi vocibus auxilium precans: *Cæmentarius eram, manibus victum quæritans. Precor te, Jesu, ut mihi restituas sanitatem ne turpitur mendicem cibos.*

2 Hieron. *ad Matt.* XXIII. 35: In Evangelio quo utuntur Nazaræni pro *filio Barachiæ*, *filum Joiadæ* reperimus scriptum.

3 Hieron. *ad Matt.* XXVII. 16: Iste (Barabbas) in Evangelio quod scribitur *juxta Hebræos*, *filius magistri eorum interpretatur.* . . .

4 Hieron. *ad Matt.* XXVII. 51: In Evangelio cujus sæpe facimus mentionem, superliminare templi infinitæ magnitudinis fractum esse atque divisum legimus. Cf. *Ep. ad Hedib.* VIII. 1: In Evangelio autem quod Hebraicis litteris scriptum est, legimus, non velum templi scissum sed superliminare templi miræ magnitudinis corruisse. I see no reason for referring the quotation given from Hegesippus (cf. p. 430, *n.*) to the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, though he used it: Euseb. *H. E.* IV. 22 (cf. *Hist. of N. T. Canon*, pp. 233, 234).

So again Jerome refers to his Hebrew friends and not to a Hebrew Gospel in *Comm. in Hab.* III. 3 (audivi Hebræum . . . disserere); *Comm. in Isai.* XI. 1 (eruditi Hebræorum), and no conclusion can be drawn from those passages as to the contents of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews.*

5 Epiph. *Hær.* XXIX. 9, p. 124: ἔχουσι δὲ τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον πληρέστατον Ἑβραϊστί. παρ' αὐτοῖς γὰρ σαφῶς τοῦτο, καθὼς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐγράφη Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν ἔτι σώζεται. οὐκ οἶδα δὲ εἰ καὶ τὰς γενεαλογίας τὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ἄχρι Χριστοῦ περιεῖλον.

6 Epiph. *Hær.* XXX. 13, p. 137: ἐν τῷ γοῦν παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐαγγελίῳ κατὰ Ματθαῖον ὀνομαζομένῳ, οὐχ ὅλῳ δὲ πληρεστάτῳ, ἀλλὰ νενοθευμένῳ καὶ ἠκρωτηριασμένῳ, Ἑβραϊκὸν δὲ τοῦτο καλοῦσιν, ἐμφέρεται, κ. τ. λ.

from this Gospel, but they present so many inconsistencies that it is evident that they cannot have belonged originally to the same book. One fragment contains a narrative of the Baptism, with the addition of apocryphal details, which gained a wide currency at a very early time. Another gives a saying of the Lord which may have been included in the original Ebionite Gospel. Of the remaining pieces one belongs to a writing like the Clementines, in which the simple form of history was exchanged for a didactic form. It is possible that this incongruous element had been incorporated in the Gospel in the time of Epiphanius; or he may have derived his information from different sources. It is only necessary to notice that the fragments were not of the same origin.

1. [In the Ebionite Gospel] the following passage occurs: There came a man by name Jesus, and He was about thirty years old, who chose us. And when He came to Capernaum He entered into the house of Simon, who was surnamed Peter, and opened his mouth and said: As I passed along the lake of Tiberias, I chose John and James, sons of Zebedee, and Simon and Andrew, and Thaddeus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas Iscariot; and thee, Matthew, I called as thou wert sitting at the receipt of custom, and thou followedst me. You, then, I wish to be twelve apostles, for a testimony to Israel.[1]

2. And John came baptizing, and Pharisees went out to him and were baptized, and all Jerusalem. And John had raiment of camels' hair, and a girdle of skin about his loins; and his food (the Gospel says) "was wild honey, the taste of which was the taste of manna, like a honey-cake steeped in oil," — that they may convert the word of truth into a lie, and put "honey-cakes" (*ἐγκρίδας*) for "locusts" (*ἀκρίδας*).[2]

3. The beginning of their Gospel is this: It came to pass in the days of Herod, king of Judæa, that John came baptizing, with a baptism of repentance, in the river Jordan, who was said to be of the race of Aaron the priest, a son of Zachariah and Elizabeth, and all went out to him.[3]

1 Epiph. *Hær.* 13, p. 137: *ἐν τῷ παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐαγγελίῳ . . . ἐμφέρεται ὅτι ἐγένετό τις ἀνὴρ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦς, καὶ αὐτὸς ὡς ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, ὃς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς. καὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος τοῦ ἐπικληθέντος Πέτρου, καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ εἶπε Παρερχόμενος παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Τιβηριάδος ἐξελεξάμην Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν Ζηλωτὴν καὶ Ἰούδαν τὸν Ἰσκαριώτην· καί σε τὸν Ματθαῖον καθεζόμενον ἐπὶ τοῦ τελωνίου ἐκάλεσα καὶ ἠκολούθησάς μοι· ὑμᾶς οὖν βούλομαι εἶναι δεκαδύο ἀποστόλους εἰς μαρτύριον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. καὶ ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης, κ. τ. λ.*

2 Epiph. *l. c.*: *καὶ ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων καὶ ἐξῆλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν Φαρισαῖοι καὶ ἐβαπτίσθησαν καὶ πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα. καὶ εἶχεν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἔνδυμα ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμήλου καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ βρῶμα αὐτοῦ, φησί, μέλι ἄγριον, οὗ ἡ γεῦσις ἦν τοῦ μάννα, ὡς ἐγκρὶς ἐν ἐλαίῳ, ἵνα δῆθεν μεταστρέψωσι τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας λόγον εἰς ψεῦδος καὶ ἀντὶ ἀκρίδων ποιήσωσιν ἐγκρίδας ἐν μέλιτι.* The variation shows that the Gospel was in *Greek*.

3 Epiph. *l. c.* This passage has apparently been interpolated from St. Luke (Zacharias, Elizabeth). In the following chapter Epiphanius again quotes the

4. And after a long interval it adds, that "when the people were baptized, Jesus also came and was baptized by John. And when He came up from the water, the heavens were opened, and he saw the Holy Spirit of God in the form of a dove, which came down and came upon him.[1] And a voice came from heaven, saying: Thou art my beloved Son; in Thee I am well pleased. And again: To-day have I begotten Thee.[2] And immediately a great light shone round about the place;[3] and John, when he saw it (the narrative continues), says to Jesus: Who art thou, Lord? And again a voice came from heaven to him [John]; This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And then (it continues) John fell down before Him, and said: I beseech thee, Lord, do thou baptize me. But he forbade him, saying, Suffer it: for thus it is becoming that all things be fulfiled."[4]

beginning of the Gospel. A comparison of the two quotations illustrates the carelessness of Epiphanius and the manner in which the text was altered.

c. 13: ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρῴδου τοῦ βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἦλθεν Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων βάπτισμα μετονοίας ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ, ὃς ἐλέγετο εἶναι ἐκ γένους Ἀαρὼν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ ἐξήρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντες.	c. 14: ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρῴδου βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Καϊάφα ἦλθέ τις Ἰωάννης ὀνόματι βαπτίζων βάπτισμα μετανοίας ἐν τῷ ποταμῷ Ἰορδάνῃ, καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς.

The insertion of ποταμῷ is worthy of notice. The word is doubtful in Matt. iii. 6, but certain in Mark i. 5.

1 The difference of this clause from the corresponding clause in the Canonical Gospel is full of meaning. There the Spirit descends (καταβαῖνον) as a Dove; here it is as a Dove which came down (κατελθούσης).

2 These words are also quoted as used at the Baptism by Justin and Hilary; and are actually given as part of the text in Luke iii. 22, in the *Codex Berne* (D), and some Latin copies.

3 This detail is added in two Latin MSS. (*Vercell.* a. *Sengerm.* g[1]): *Et cum baptizaretur* (*Jesus* g[1]) *lumen ingens* (*magnum* g[1]) *circumfulsit* (*fulgebat* g[1]) *de aqua, ita ut timerent omnes qui advenerant* (*qui congregati erant* g[1]). Cf. Just. M. *Dial.* 88; *Sibyll. Orac.* VII. 82—84.

It is worthy of remark that in an addition which occurs in another Latin MS. (*Bobb.* k), a miraculous (?) light is connected with the resurrection: Mark xvi. 4, *Subito autem ad horam tertiam tenebræ diei* (? *d. ten.*) *factæ sunt per totum orbem terræ, et descenderunt de cœlis angeli, et surgentes*] *in claritate visi Dei simul ascenderunt cum eo, et continuo lux facta est.*

4 Epiph. *Hær.* xxx. 13, p. 138: καὶ μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν πολλὰ ἐπιφέρει ὅτι τοῦ λαοῦ βαπτισθέντος ἦλθε καὶ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου. καὶ ὡς ἀνῆλθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος ἠνοίγησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ εἶδε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ ἅγιον ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς κατελθούσης καὶ εἰσελθούσης εἰς αὐτόν· καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λέγουσα, Σύ μου εἶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ ηὐδόκησα· καὶ πάλιν Ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε. Καὶ εὐθὺς περιέλαμψε τὸν τόπον φῶς μέγα. ὃν (*l.* ὃ) ἰδών, φησίν, ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγει αὐτῷ Σύ, τίς εἶ Κύριε; καὶ πάλιν φωνὴ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ πρὸς αὐτόν, Οὗ-

5. Cf. p. 447, No. 8.

6. [In the account of the Last Supper they add the interrogative and the word *flesh*], saying: Have I earnestly desired to eat this flesh, the Passover, with you?[1]

7. They say, according to their absurd argument: *It is sufficient for the disciple to be as his Master.*[2]

III. The Gospel of the Clementine Homilies.

The numerous quotations which occur in the Clementine Homilies are generally allowed to furnish another form of the Ebionite Gospel. It may, however, be very fairly questioned whether the peculiarities which these quotations exhibit may not be more properly referred to oral tradition or to errors of memory than to any one written source. With one or two exceptions, the Homilies contain no sayings of the Lord which are not either mere duplicates of passages in the Gospels or deductions which follow directly from them. The subjoined list contains, I believe, a complete list of the passages quoted in the Homilies. The quotations marked by Italics are verbal in the main; the remainder generally give the sense of the corresponding passage of the canonical Gospel in other words.[3]

Matt. v. 3. . . Cf. Hom. xv. 10: ὁ διδάσκαλος ἡμῶν πιστοὺς πένητας ἐμακάρισεν.

v. 8. . . . . Cf. Hom. xvii. 7: ἵνα οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτὸν ἰδεῖν δυνηθῶσιν.

v. 17. . . . . *Hom.* iii. 51: οὐκ ἦλθον κ. τ. ν.

xxiv. 35; v. 18. *Hom.* iii. 51: ὁ οὐ ρ. — παρελ. ἰῶτα ἕν — τ. νόμου.

v. 34, 35. . . . Hom. iii. 56: μὴ ὀμόσητε τὸν οὐρ. — ὑποπόδ. τ. π. αὐ. ἐ.

v. 37. . . . . Hom. iii. 55; xix. 2: ἔστω ὑμ. τὸ ναὶ ναί, (καὶ) τὸ οὒ οὔ· τὸ γὰρ π. — πον. ἐ. Cf. 2 Cor. i. 17.

v. 39–41. . . . Cf. Hom. xv. 5.

v. 44. . . . . Cf. Hom. iii. 19.

τός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐφ' ὃν ηὐδόκησα. Καὶ τότε, φησίν, ὁ Ἰωάννης προσπεσὼν αὐτῷ ἔλεγε Δέομαί σου Κύριε, σύ με βάπτισον. ὁ δὲ ἐκῶλυεν αὐτῷ λέγων Ἄφες, ὅτι οὕτως ἐστὶ πρέπον πληρωθῆναι πάντα.

1 Epiph. *Hær.* xxx. 22, p. 146: ἐποίησαν . . . αὐτὸν λέγοντα Μὴ ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα κρέας τοῦτο τὸ Πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν. Immediately below Epiphanius quotes the passage: Μὴ ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ Πάσχα κρέας φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν. The true reading was probably κρέας τοῦτο, or τοῦτο τὸ κρέας.

2 Epiph. *Hær.* xxx. 26, p. 151; φασὶ γὰρ κατὰ τὸν ἐκείνων ληρώδη λόγον Ἀρκετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ εἶναι ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος. If it were not that Epiphanius quotes the passage again in the same form (§ 30, p. 160), it would seem that the change (εἶναι for ἵνα γένηται) was simply an error of his.

3 The Clementine quotations are printed in a convenient form by Credner, *Beiträge*, I. pp. 284 ff.

I have discussed the quotations of Justin M. elsewhere: *Hist. of N. T. Canon*, pp. 133 ff.

Matt. v. 45. . . Hom. iii. 57. Cf. xii. 26; xviii. 2.
vi. 6. . . . . Hom. iii. 55.
vi. 32. 8. . . . *Hom.* iii. 55; οἶδεν γάρ — ἀπ. πρὶν αὐτὸν ἀξιώσητε.
vi. 13. . . . . *Hom.* xix. 2: ῥ. — τ. πον.
vii. 2. . . . . Cf. Hom. xviii. 16.
vii. 7. . . . . Hom. iii. 52: ζητ. καὶ εὑρίσκετε.
vii. 9–11. . . . *Hom.* iii. 56: τίνα αἰτήσει υἱ. ἄρτον — ἢ καὶ ἰχθ. — ὁ π. ὑ. ὁ οὐράνιος — τοῖς αἰτουμένοις αὐτὸν καὶ τοῖς ποιοῦσιν τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ.
vii. 12. . . . . Cf. Hom. xii. 32: ὃ θέλει ἑαυτῷ θέλει καὶ τῷ πλησίον. Cf. vii. 4.
vii. 13, 14. . . Hom. xviii. 17.
vii. 15, 16. . . Hom. vii. 15, 16.
vii. 21. . . . . Cf. Hom. viii. 7: τί με λέγεις,κ ύριε, κύριε, καὶ οὐ ποιεῖς ἃ λέγω.
viii. 11. . . . Hom. viii. 4.
viii. 5–11. . . . Cf. Hom. ix. 21.
viii. 24. . . . Cf. Hom. xix. 14.
viii. 31. . . . Cf Hom. xix. 14.
ix. 12. . . . . Hom. iii. 56: ὁ Θεὸς ἔλεος θέλει καὶ οὐ θυσίαν, ἐπιγνωσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐχ ὁλοκαυτώματα (Hos. vi. 6).
x. 10. . . . . Hom. iii. 7: ἀξ. ἐ. ὁ ἐργ. τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ. Cf. Luke x. 7; 1 Tim. v. 18.
x. 11–15. . . . Cf. Hom. iii. 30, 31.
x. 28. . . . . Hom. xvii. 5.
x. 29, 30. . . . Cf. Hom. xii. 31.
x. 34, 35. . . . Cf. Hom. xi. 19.
xi. 11. . . . . Cf. Hom. ii. 17.
xi. 25. . . . . Hom. viii. 6: ἐξομ. σ. πάτερ τοῦ οὐρ. καὶ τ. γ. ὅτι ἐκ. τ. ἀ. σ. πρεσβυτέρων καὶ — νηπ. θηλάζουσιν. Cf. Hom. xvii. 5; xviii. 15.
xi. 27. . . . . Hom. xvii. 4; xviii. 4: οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς ὡς οὐδὲ τὸν υἱόν τις οἶδεν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ καὶ οἷς ἂν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.
xi. 28. . . . . *Hom.* iii. 52: δεῦτε — κοπιῶντες.
xii. 26. . . . *Hom.* xix. 2: εἰ ὁ Σ. — π. οὖν αὐτοῦ στήκῃ ἡ βασιλεία;
xii. 34. . . . Hom. xix. 7: ἐκ π. κ. στ. λ.
xii. 41. . . . Hom. xi. 33.
xii. 42. . . . *Hom.* xi. 33: βασ. ν. ἐγερθ. μ. τ. γ. — ἀπὸ τ. π. — Σολ. ωδε καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε.
xiii. 17. . . . Hom. iii. 53.
xiii. 39. . . . Cf. Hom. xix. 2.
xiii. 52. . . . Cf. Hom. viii. 7.
xv. 13. . . . *Hom.* iii. 52: πᾶσα φ. — ὁ π. ὁ οὐρ. ἐκρ.
xvi. 13 ff. . . . Hom. xvii. 18 f.

Matt. xvii. 5. . . Hom. xvii. 53: *οὗτος ἐστίν μου ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητὸς εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησα· τούτου ἀκούετε.*
xvii. 20. . . . Cf. Hom. xi. 16: *διὰ πίστεως. . . . τὰ ὄρεσιν ἐοικότα. . . . . μεθίστησι πάθη.*
xviii. 10. . . . Hom. xvii. 7.
xviii. 17. . . . Hom. xii. 29. Cf. p. 449. *num.* 18.
xix. 8, 4. . . . Hom. iii. 54.
xix. 16–18. . . Cf. Hom. xviii. 3.
xx. 16; xxii. 14. *Hom.* viii. 4: *πολλ. κλ. ὀλ. δὲ ἐκλ.*
xxii. 1–14. . . Cf. Hom. viii. 22.
xxii. 23. . . . Cf. Hom. iii. 54.
xxii. 32. . . . Hom. iii. 55: *οὐκ ἔστιν θ. ν. ἀλλὰ ζ.*
xxiii. 2, 3. . . Hom. iii. 18.
xxiii. 13. . . . Cf. Hom xviii. 16.
xxiii. 25, 26. . *Hom.* xi. 29: *οὐαὶ ὑ. γρ. καὶ φ. ὑ. ὁ. κ. τ. ποτ. — τὸ ἐξ. ἐσ. δὲ γέμει ῥύπους.*
xxiv. 2, 34. . . Hom. iii. 15.
xxiv. 45–51. . . Hom. iii. 60; 64.
xxv. 21. . . . *Hom.* iii. 65: *εὖ δ. — πιστέ.*
xxv. 26. . . . Hom. iii. 61.
xxv. 41. . . . Hom. xix. 2. Cf. xx. 9.
xxviii. 19. . . Cf. Hom. xvii. 7.

In addition to these passages there are others which present parallels with the remaining canonical Gospels.

Mark iv. 34. . . Hom. xix. 20: *διὸ καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς κατ' ἰδίαν ἐπέλυε τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας τὰ μυστήρια.*
vii. 26. . . . Hom. ii. 19: *Συροφοινίκισσα.*
xii. 29. . . . *Hom.* iii. 57 (Deut. vi. 4).
Luke viii. 18. . Cf. Hom, xviii. 16 (*κἂν δοκῇ ἔχειν*).
x. 18. . . . . Cf. Hom. xix. 2.
x. 20. . . . . Cf. Hom. ix. 22.
xviii. 1–8. . . . Hom. xvii. 5.
xix. 1–10. . . Cf. Hom. iii. 63.
xxiii. 34. . . . Hom. xi. 20.
John iii. 5. . . Hom. xi. 26.
ix. 1 ff. . . . *Hom.* xix. 22.
x. 9. . . . . Hom. iii. 52: *ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ πύλη τῆς ζωῆς.*
x. 27. . . . . Hom. iii. 52: *τὰ ἐμὰ πρόβατα ἀκούει τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς.*

IV. The Gospel of Marcion.

Tertullian and Epiphanius[1] supply us with materials for reconstructing the Gospel which Marcion published as "the Gospel of the Lord," or "of

[1] *c. Hæres.* xlii. pp. 309 seqq. It will be sufficient for our purpose to refer only to Tertullian, who examines the Gospel of Marcion in the fourth book of his treatise against him. Several variations which occur in Epiphanius appear to be later errors of transcription, or errors of Epiphanius himself.

Christ." It does not appear that he made any additions to the Pauline narrative of St. Luke, which he adopted as the basis of his history; and the following table[1] will show how much of it he recognized. In most cases the reasons for the changes and omissions will be evident, when we bear in mind the peculiar features of the Marcionite heresy.

ST. LUKE.		
	The first, second, and third chapters of St. Luke were wanting in Marcion's Gospel, which began with the	
(iii. 1).	words: "In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar [God[2]]	*Tertull. adv. Marc. iv. 7.*
(iv. 31).	came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee, and was teaching on the Sabbath-day."	
iv. 32–37. . .	*v.* 34=Ναζαρηνέ	
iv. 38, 39. . .	Doubtful.	
iv. 16–30. . .	Omitting all reference to the Old Testament, and in v. 16=*οὗ ἦν τεθραμμένος* and *κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ*.	*id. iv. 8.*
iv. 40–44. . .	Entire.	
v. 1–39. . . .	Entire.[3] In *v.* 14, *ἵνα εἰς μαρτύριον ᾖ ὑμῖν τοῦτο.*	*id. iv. 9–11.*
vi. 1–49. . .	Entire.[4] In *v.* 17, *κατέβη ἐν αὐτοῖς.*	*id. iv. 12–17.* *id. iv. 18.*
vii. 1–28; 36–50.	*vv.* 29—35 are opposed to Marcion's view of the relation of John the Baptist to Jesus, and to his idea of the true Christian life.	
viii. 1–18; 20–56;	Entire.[5]	
ix. 1–62. . .	In *v.* 30 Marcion seems to have read *συνέστησαν αὐτῷ* (or rather *ἔστησαν μετ' αὐτοῦ*); and in place of *v.* 31, only *ὀφθέντες ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ*.[6]	*adv. Marc. iv. 19, 20.* *id. iv. 21–23.*

1 In the construction of this table I have chiefly followed Hahn's edition of Marcion's Gospel, published in Thilo, *Codex Apocryphus*, pp. 403–408; and I have throughout compared my own table with that given by De Wette (*Einl.* § 71 *b*), who quotes the results of Ritschl's investigations into the subject. All the passages of St. Luke which were contained in Marcion's Gospel are placed in the first column, and any significant variations are noted in the second.

2 The Marcionites maintained the notion of a sudden and unexpected (subitum ex inopinato, *Tertull. l. c.*) appearance of the good Deity to frustrate the designs of the God of the Jews. Cf. Neander, *Church History*, II. pp. 182, sqq.

3 Tertullian (*adv. Marc.* IV. 11) acutely criticizes the impropriety of the sudden introduction of John the Baptist after the removal of the opening chapters of St. Luke's Gospel. Marcion's explanation of vv. 14, 36–39, may be seen in Tertullian, *adv. Marc.* IV. 9, 11 (pp. 210, 222).

4 Marcion explained *v.* 23, and the "woe" in *v.* 24, so as to accord with his own views: Tertull. *adv. Marc.* IV. 15.

5 Marcion represented the announcement of "the mother and brethren of Jesus" as made "*tentandi gratiâ:*" *adv. Marc.* IV. 19, p. 260. According to Epiphanius, *ἡ μήτηρ — ἀδ. αὐ.* were wanting.

6 The explanation which Marcion gave of the Transfiguration is interest-

adv. Marc. iv. 24, 25.	x. 1–11; 16–42.	*v.* 21 = *πάτερ* and *καὶ τῆς γῆς.* The order in *v.* 22 was reversed by Marcion; *v.* 24 he probably read only *ὅτι πρ. οὐκ εἶδον ἃ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε. v.* 25 = *αἰώνιον.*[1]
id. iv. 26, 27.	xi. 1–29; 33–48; 52–54.	Cf. *Varr. Lectt.* in *v.* 2; *v.* 29 = *εἰ μὴ τὸ σημ.* Ἰω.[2] In *v.* 42 he read *κλῆσιν* for *κρίσιν*, and = *ταῦτα — ἀφιέναι.*
id. iv. 28, 29.	xii. 1–5; 8–59;	In *vv.* 8, 9, *ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ.*[3]
id. iv. 30.	xiii 10–28. . .	In *v.* 28, for Ἀβραάμ — *προφήτας*, Marcion read *πάντας τοὺς δικαίους*, and added *ἐκβ. καὶ κρατουμένους ἔξω.*
id. iv. 31.	xiv. 1–6; 12–35.	In *v.* 26, Marcion read *καταλείπει* for *μισεῖ.*
id. iv. 32.	xv. 1–10. . .	In *v.* 10, *ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ.* Cf. xii. 8, 9.
id. iv. 33, 34.	xvi. 1–31. . .	In *v.* 12, *τὸ ἐμόν.* In *v.* 17, for the last clause Marcion read: *μοῦ ἢ τῶν λόγων μίαν κερ. π.*[4]
id. iv. 35.	xvii. 1–6; 11–37.	Marcion added in *v.* 2, *εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ἦ* [*εἰ*] *λι. μ*; and inserted Luke iv. 27 after v. 14.
id. iv. 36.	xviii. 1–30; 35–43.	*v.* 37 = *ὁ Ναζωραῖος.* Cf. iv. 34.
id. iv. 37.	xix. 1–28; 47, 48.	*v.* 9 = *καθότι — ἐστίν.*
id. iv. 38.	xx. 1–8; 19–36; 39–47.	Entire.
id. iv. 39.	xxi. 5–17; 19, 20; 23–38.	*v.* 27 = *καὶ δόξης.*[5] In *v.* 32, for *ἡ γενέα αὕτη*, Marcion read *ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ. v.* 36 = *καὶ — ἀνθρώπου.*
id. iv. 40, 41.	xxii. 1–15; (17, 18) 19–29; 31–34; 39–41; 45–48; 52–71.	*v.* 3 = *εἰσῆλθε δὲ σατανᾶς.*
id. iv. 42.	xxiii. 1–42; 44–46; 50–56.[6]	*v.* 3 = *τῶν Ἰουδαίων. v.* 34 = *διαμερίζόμενοι — κλῆρον.*

ing: *adv. Marc.* IV. 22. He justifies the apparent harshness of vv. 57 seqq.

1 Cf. Tertull. *adv. Marc.* IV. 25, p. 293.

2 Marcion supposed that "the strong man armed" (v. 21) meant the Creator — the God of the Jews, and "the stronger man," the good Deity. Tertull. IV. 26, p. 299.

3 In v. 5, the "fearful God" is the Creator, who is also signified by "the thief" (v. 39). Tertull. *l. c.* pp. 304, 311.

4 For Marcion's explanation of the parable (19–31) see Tertull. *l. c.* pp. 328 seqq. The words *sicut et lex et prophetæ* (Tertull. IV. 33) seem to be a comment of Tertullian.

5 Marcion probably applied the passage to the Jewish Messiah (Hahn).

6 Epiphanius represents Marcion as

xxiv. 1–26; 28–47. *v.* 25, οἷς ἐλάλησεν ὑμῖν. *v.* 32 = ὡς διην. ἡμ. τ. γραφάς. *v.* 37, φάντασμα for πνεῦμα. *v.* 39 = ψηλαφήσατε, σάρκα. *v.* 44 = ὅτι — ἐμοῦ. *v.* 45 = τότε — αὐτοῖς. *v.* 46 = ὅτι — γέγραπται.[1] *id. iv.* 43.

No one of the remaining Apocryphal Gospels claims any special notice. The fragments quoted from the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*[2] have been already given; and of the Gospels of Basilides, Cerinthus, Apelles, Matthias, we know little more than the names. But there is another class of writings also called Apocryphal Gospels, to which the *Gospels of the Infancy* and the *Gospel of Nicodemus* belong, which cannot be left wholly unnoticed. The narratives which we have hitherto examined were either based on the same oral traditions as the canonical Gospels, or revisions of the canonical texts; but these enter on a new field, and illustrate the writings of the New Testament more by the complete contrast which they offer to the spirit and style of the whole, than by minute yet significant divergences from particular books. The completeness of the antithesis which these spurious stories offer to the divine record appears at once — if we may be allowed for a moment to compare light with darkness — in relation to the treatment of the three great elements of the Gospel history, miracles, parables, and prophecy, the lessons of power, of nature, and of providence. In the Apocryphal miracles we find no worthy conception of the laws of providential interference; they are wrought to supply personal wants, or to gratify private feelings, and often are positively immoral. Nor, again, is there any spiritual element in their working; they are arbitrary displays of power, and without any spontaneity on our Lord's part or on that of the recipient. The Apocryphal Gospels[3] are also entirely without parables; they exhibit no sense of those deeper relations between nature and man — between corruption and sin — which are so frequently declared in the Synoptic Gospels. And, at the same time, they do not rise to the purely spiritual theology of St. John, which in its very essence rises above the mixed earthly existence of man.

As to miracles:

Parables:

Yet more, they do not recognize the office of prophecy; they make no reference to the struggles of the Church, with the old forms of sin and evil reproduced from age to age, till the final *regeneration of all things*. History in them becomes a mere collection of traditions, and is regarded neither as the fulfilment of the past nor as the type of the future.

Prophecy.

introducing various changes into *v.* 2, of which traces appear elsewhere. Cf. Tischdf. *ad loc.*

1 It appears that the end of Marcion's Gospel was as abrupt as the commencement. Compare Hahn, *l. c.* p. 486.

2 Cf. p. 448, n. 3.

3 Compare the following passages in the Apocryphal Gospels:

(*a*) Gosp. Inf. 14–20, 38 (ed. Thilo).
Gosp. Thom. 5.
Gosp. Inf. 29, 47, 49.

(*b*) Gosp. Inf. 23, 36–7, 40.
Gosp. Inf. 15, 17 sqq.

The differences in style are not less than these differences in spirit. For the depth of a spiritual sequence we have affected explanations and irrelevant details.[1] And the divine wisdom of our Gospels stands in clear contrast to mere dreams of fancy, if we compare some Scripture story with obvious parallels in the most esteemed of the Apocryphal histories. Thus, we might refer to the cure of the dæmoniac (*Gosp. Inf.* 14), and the recital in St. Luke (viii. 26—32); to the discourse from the Mount of Beatitudes (Matt. v.—vii.), and the address from Mount Olivet (*Gosp. Joseph.* I. sqq.); to the inspired records of the Crucifixion, and the *Gospel of Nicodemus*. For even these wild legends have their use. If the corruptions of the Gospels lead us back to a common source preserved in our Canon, the fables of early times teach us how far the characteristics of the Gospels were above the natural taste of the first Christians.

APPENDIX E.

A CLASSIFICATION OF THE GOSPEL MIRACLES.

Πιστευετέ μοι ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί· εἰ δὲ μή, διὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτὰ πιστεύετε. — ST. JOHN XIV. 11.

I HAVE examined elsewhere[2] the general relations of the Gospel Miracles as a Revelation — a whole in themselves of singular harmony and completeness: at present it will be sufficient to give an outline of the results obtained, by presenting a classification of the Miracles, which will exhibit their mutual connections.[3]

I. MIRACLES ON NATURE.

1. MIRACLES OF CREATIVE POWER.

(*a*) *The Water made Wine:* John ii. 1—12.
Character changed. Christ the Source of Joy.

(*b*) *The Bread multiplied.*

a. Matt. xiv. 15—21; Mark vi. 35—44; Luke ix. 12—17; John vi. 5—14.

b. Matt. xv. 32—39; Mark viii. 1—10.
Substance increased. Christ the Source of Subsistence.

1 Cf. Gosp. Inf. 50-2. 47-8. Protev. S. Jac. III. Gosp. Joseph. 16, 17.

2 *Characteristics of the Gospel Miracles*, Cambr. 1859.

3 The arrangement proposed is not offered as absolute or final. It offers,

(*c*) *The walking on the Water:* Matt. xiv. 22—26; Mark vi. 48, 49; John vi. 16—21.
Force controlled. Christ the Source of strength.

2. MIRACLES OF PROVIDENCE.

(*a*) *Miracles of Blessing.*

a. *The first Miraculous Draught of Fishes:* Luke v. 1—11.
The foundation of the outward Church.

b. *The Storm Stilled:* Matt. viii. 23—27; Mark iv. 35—41; Luke viii. 22—25.
The defence of the Church from without.

c. *The Stater in the Fish's Mouth:* Matt. xvii. 24—27.
The support of the Church from within.

d. *The second Miraculous Draught of Fishes:* John xxi. 1—23.
The Church of the future.

(*b*) *Miracle of Judgment.*
The fig-tree cursed: Matt. xxi. 19 ff.; Mark xi. 20 ff.

II. MIRACLES ON MAN.

1. MIRACLES OF PERSONAL FAITH.

(*a*) *Organic Defects* (the Blind).

a. Faith *special.*
The two blind men in the house: Matt. ix. 29—31.

b. Faith *absolute.*
Bartimæus restored: Matt. xx. 29—34; Mark x. 46—52; Luke xviii. 35—43.

(*b*) *Chronic Impurity.*

a. Open. Leprosy.
Faith *special.*
The one Leper: Matt. viii. 1—4; Mark i. 40—45; Luke v. 12—16.
Faith *special* and *absolute* contrasted.
The Ten Lepers: Luke xvii. 11—19.

b. Secret.
The Woman with the Issue: Matt. ix. 20—22; Mark v. 25—34; Luke viii. 43—48.

2. MIRACLES OF INTERCESSION.

(*a*) *Organic Defects.* (Simple Intercession.)

a. *The blind:* Mark viii. 22—26.

b. *The deaf and dumb:* Mark vii. 31—37.

(*b*) *Mortal sicknesses.* (Intercession based on natural ties.)

a. Fever.
The nobleman's son healed: John iv. 46—54.

unless I am mistaken, *one* very natural and instructive view of relations which are many-sided; and at least it is sufficient to show that *some* connection exists. Deeper study may lay open more subtle and profound points of union between the different incidents.

b. Paralysis.

The centurion's servant healed: Matt. viii. 5—13; Luke vii. 1—10.

The man borne of four healed: Matt. ix. 1—8; Mark ii. 1—12; Luke v. 17—26.

3. MIRACLES OF LOVE.

(*a*) *Organic Defect.*

The blind man healed: John ix.

(*b*) *Disease.*

a. The fever healed: Matt. viii. 14, 15; Mark i. 29—34: Luke iv. 38—41.

b. The dropsy healed: Luke xiv. 1—6.

c. The withered hand restored: Matt. xii. 9—13; Mark iii. 1—5; Luke vi. 6—11.

d. The impotent man restored: John v. 1—17.

e. The woman with a spirit of infirmity set free: Luke xiii. 10—17.

(*c*) *Death.*

a. The Death-chamber.

A girl raised: Matt. ix. 18 ff.; Mark v. 22 ff.; Luke viii. 41 ff.

b. The bier.

A young man raised: Luke vii. 11—18.

c. The tomb.

A tried friend raised: John xi.[1]

III. MIRACLES ON THE SPIRIT-WORLD.

1. MIRACLES OF INTERCESSION.

(*a*) *Simple Intercession.*

a. A dumb man possessed by a devil: Matt. ix. 32—34.

b. A blind and a dumb man: Matt. xii. 22 ff. Cf. Luke xi. 14 ff.

(*b*) *Intercession based on natural ties.*

a. The Syrophœnician's daughter healed: Matt. xv. 21—28; Mark vii. 24—30.

b. The lunatic boy healed: Matt. xvii. 14 ff.; Mark ix. 14 ff.; Luke ix. 37 ff.

2. MIRACLES OF ANTAGONISM.

(*a*) *In the Synagogue.*

The unclean spirit cast out: Mark i. 21—28; Luke iv. 31—37.

1 The healing of Malchus (Luke xxii. 51) seems not to fall within the true cycle of the Gospel Miracles either in character or import. We may see in it how the Divine Power represses and remedies the evils caused by inconsiderate zeal.

(*b*) *In the Tombs.*

The Legion cast out: Matt. viii. 28—34; Mark v. 1—17; Luke viii. 26—37.

It will be seen that in the fundamental and crowning miracle of the Gospel — the Resurrection — all these forms of miraculous working are included. The course of nature was controlled, for there was a great earthquake; the laws of material existence were overruled, for when the doors were shut Jesus came into the midst of His disciples, and when their eyes were opened He vanished out of their sight. The reign of death was overthrown, for many of the saints came out of their graves and went into the Holy City. The powers of the spiritual world were called forth, for angels watched at the sepulchre and ministered to believers. Thus full and harmonious is the whole strain of Scripture: *All things are double, one against another, and God hath made nothing imperfect.*

Matt. xxviii. 2. John xx. 6.

Luke xxiv. 31. Matt. xxvii. 53.

Matt. xxvii. 2. etc.

Wisd. xlii. 25.

APPENDIX F.

A CLASSIFICATION OF THE GOSPEL PARABLES.

Πάντα δισσά, ἓν κατέναντι τοῦ ἑνός·
καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲν ἐλλεῖπον. — Ecclus. xlii. 24.

We have already endeavored to discover in the combination of the Gospel miracles the laws of Divine interference for the Redemption of man, and the proofs of the universality of the Saviour's power; it will be our object now to point out the converse truths from a consideration of the Parables: in them we shall seek to mark the lessons which we may learn from the Natural World on the progress and scope of Revelation, and the testimony which man's own heart renders to the Christian Morality. Thus it is that the Miracles and Parables are exactly correlative to each other; in the one we see the personality and power of the Worker, and in the other the generality and constancy of the Work; in the one we are led to refer the ordinary events of life to God, and in the other to consider their relation to man: in the one we are led to regard the manifoldness of Providence, and in the other to recognize the instructiveness of the Universe.

The relation of Parables to Miracles.

The Parables in the Gospels may be presented in the following classification, if we consider the sources from which they are drawn.

I. PARABLES DRAWN FROM THE MATERIAL WORLD.

1. THE SOURCES OF THE ELEMENTS OF NATURAL OR SPIRITUAL LIFE:
   (*a*) The Power of Good. *The Sower:* Matt. xiii. 3—8; Mark iv. 4—8; Luke viii. 5—8.
   (*b*) The Power of Evil. *The Tares:* Matt. xiii. 24—30.

2. THE MODE OF THEIR DEVELOPMENT SILENT AND MYSTERIOUS. *The Seed growing secretly:* Mark iv. 26—29.

3. THE FULNESS OF THEIR DEVELOPMENT:
   (*a*) An outward Growth. *The Mustard-seed:* Matt. xiii. 31, 32; Mark iv. 30—32; Luke xiii. 18, 19.
   (*b*) An inward Change. *The Leaven:* Matt. xiii. 33; Luke xiii. 20, 21.

II. PARABLES DRAWN FROM THE RELATIONS OF MAN.

1. TO THE LOWER WORLD, as explaining his Connection also with higher Beings,[1] while he
   (*a*) Destroys the worthless (σαπρά). *The Draw-net:* Matt. xiii. 47—50.
   (*b*) Labors with the unfruitful. *The barren Fig-tree:* Luke xiii. 6—9.
   (*c*) Seeks to reclaim the lost, whether it has been lost
      a. By its own Wandering. *The lost sheep:* Matt. xviii. 12—14; Luke xv. 3—7.
      b. By his Carelessness. *The lost Drachma:* Luke xv. 8—10.

2. TO HIS FELLOW-MEN:
   (*a*) In the Family, from the higher to the lower, as explaining his personal relations to God:
      a. Mercy. *The unmerciful Servant:* Matt. xviii. 23—35.
      Correlative: Gratitude. *The two Debtors:* Luke vii. 41—43.
      b. Forgiveness. *The prodigal Son:* Luke xv. 11—32.
      Correlative: Obedience. *The two Sons:* Matt. xxi. 28—32.
   (*b*) IN SOCIAL LIFE, as explaining his Relations to the Church:
      a. Zeal in the Petition for Blessings:
         i. For others. *The Friend at Midnight:* Luke xi. 5—8.
         ii. For ourselves. *The unjust Judge:* Luke xviii. 1—8.

1 Cf. Matt. xiii. 49, 50: Luke xv. 7 (χαρὰ ἔσται ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ· when the Redemption was accomplished): Luke xv. 10 (χαρὰ γίνεται ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ· when the careless within the existing Church were awakened). It is easy to see why there is no corresponding clause in "the Prodigal Son."

b. Patience in the course of Life:
i. For others, Endurance. *The ten Virgins:* Matt. xxv. 1—13.
ii. In ourselves, Self-denial. *The lower Seats:* Luke xiv. 7—11.
c. Regard for outward Ordinances:
i. As a feeling from within. *The great Supper:* Luke xiv. 15—24.
ii. As required by their Dignity. *The King's Marriage-feast:* Matt. xxii. 1—14.

(*c*) In regard to his means, as explaining the Devotion of our Endowments to God's Service:
a. Thoughtfulness in planning his Works, as to
i. His own power:
Absolutely. *The Tower-builder:* Luke xiv. 28—30.
Relatively. *The King making War:* Luke xiv. 31—33.
ii. Their effects on others. *The unjust Steward:* Luke xvi. 1—9.
b. In his Works.
i. As to himself, Fruitfulness:
Absolutely. *The Talents:* Matt. xxv. 14—30.
Relatively. *The Pounds*: Luke xix. 11—27.
ii. As to others, Unselfishness. *The wicked Husbandmen:* Matt. xxi. 33–44; Mark xii. 1—12; Luke xx. 9—18.
c. After the completion of his Works:
i. As to himself, Humility. *The unprofitable Servants:* Luke xvii. 7—10.
ii. As to others, Dependence. *The Laborers in the Vineyard:* Matt. xx. 1—16.

3. To Providence, as teaching that spiritually as well as temporally Advantages imply Duties, whether we obtain them
(*a*) Unexpectedly. *The hid Treasure:* Matt. xiii. 44.
(*b*) After a zealous Search. *The Man seeking Pearls:* Matt. xiii. 45, 46.
(*c*) By natural Inheritance. *The rich Fool:* Luke xii. 16—21.

There are still remaining three symbolic narratives which are usually ranked as Parables:—"The Publican and Pharisee," "The Good Samaritan," and "The Rich Man and Lazarus." These, however, in their primary reference give direct patterns for action, and in their secondary meaning apply to classes, and not to individuals. It seems as if we may read in them the opposition of Christianity to Judaism, in its essential Spirituality, in its universal Love, and in its outward Lowliness.

ADDITIONS FOR PAGE 367,

RECEIVED TOO LATE FOR INSERTION THERE. SEE INTRODUCTION TO AMERICAN EDITION, p. x.

a The following parables are recorded by St. Mark. That which is peculiar to him is marked by Italics.

1. The sower (iv. 4—8).
2. *The seed growing secretly* (iv. 26—29).
3. The mustard seed (iv. 30—32).

The unity and completeness of the lesson which these convey must be obvious without comment.

b The miracles recorded by St. Mark are both numerous and characteristic of his Gospel. Peculiar narratives are (as before) marked by Italics.

1 The unclean spirit cast out (i. 21—28).
2. The fever healed (i. 29—34).
3. The leper cleansed (i. 40—45).
4. The palsy healed (ii. 1—12).
5. The withered hand restored (iii. 1—5) [iii. 10, 11, Many healed: unclean spirits cast out].
6. The tempest stilled (iv. 35—41).
7. The legion cast out (v. 1—17).
8. The woman with issue healed (v. 25—34).
9. Jairus' daughter raised (v. 22 ff.).
10. The five thousand fed (vi. 35—44).
11. The walking on the water (vi. 48, 49) [vi. 54 ff., all that touched Christ made whole].
12. The Syrophœnician's daughter healed (vii. 24—30).
13. *The deaf and dumb healed* (vii. 31—37).
14. The four thousand fed (viii. 1—10).
15. *The blind man healed* (viii. 22—26).
16. The deaf and dumb spirit cast out (ix. 14 ff.).
17. Bartimæus healed (x. 26—52).
18. The fig-tree cursed (xi. 20 ff.).

INDEX.

ADVENT, attempts to fix the date of, 142.

ALEXANDRIA, the meeting-point of Judaism and Greece, 83.

ANTIGONUS OF SOCHO, 86.

ANTIOCHUS, effects of his persecution, 85.

APOCALYPSE, usage of term in New Testament, 34 *n.*

APOCALYPSE AND PROPHECY CONTRASTED, 93 *n.*

APOCRYPHAL JEWISH BOOKS, 93; silent as to a personal Messiah, 112; Gospels (see Gospel), 454; sayings of our Lord, 445; works of our Lord, 452.

APOLOGISTS, on Inspiration, 412.

APOSTLES, their relation to Christianity, 174.

APOSTLES, their different views of Christianity, 222.

ASSEMBLY, the great, 81

ATHENAGORAS ON INSPIRATION, 410.

AUGUSTINE, his essay on the Gospels, 251.

BAPTISM OF OUR LORD, accounts of the, 314.

BARNABAS ON INSPIRATION, 403.

CAIUS ON INSPIRATION, 417.

CALVINISTIC VIEW OF INSPIRATION, 31.

CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, 77 *n.*

CLAUDIUS APOLLINARIS ON INSPIRATION, 413.

CLEMENS (Rom.) ON INSPIRATION, 404.

CLEMENS (Alex.) ON INSPIRATION, 425.

CLEMENTINE HOMILIES ON INSPIRATION, 441.

CLEMENTINE RECOGNITIONS ON INSPIRATION, 443.

COMPLETENESS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE, 53–59.

CONCORDANCES between the Gospels, 200.

CONNECTING PHRASES used by the Evangelists, 345 *n.*; (last journey to Jerusalem), 378 *n.*

CRUCIFIXION, Synoptic narratives of the, 321; day of the, 289 *n.*; 338.

CYPRIAN ON INSPIRATION, 422.

DIFFICULTIES OF THE GOSPELS, their origin, 387; their usefulness, 393.

DIOGNETUM (*Ep. ad.*) ON INSPIRATION, 407.

DOCTORS, sayings of the later, 91.

ECCLESIASTICUS, 91.

ESDRAS 2, its character, 126; its doctrine of Messiah, 129.

ESSENES of Palentinian origin, 89 *n.*

EVANGELISTS not conspicuous in history, 229.

EVANGELISTS, their emblems, 250.

FAITH AND REASON in relation with Scripture, 392.

FLIGHT INTO EGYPT, 313 *n.*

GEMARA, singular reference to Messiah, 153.

GENEALOGIES OF OUR LORD, 310 *n.*

"GOSPEL," use of term, 180; oral in origin, 198, 212; facts mentioned in Acts of the Apostles, 183; the Epistles, 185; its first preaching historic, 182, 191.

GOSPELS, the four, their general character, 46, 178, 212, 286, 387; inspired

history, 218; embody Apostolic preaching, 178, 229; order of their composition, 214 *n.*; their distinctive character, 221, 229, 387; their real unity, 252; their difficulties, 386; their historical authority, 389.
GOSPEL according to the Hebrews, 454; according to the Egyptians, 448 *n.*
GOSPEL of the Ebionites, 457; of the Clementine Homilies, 460; of Marcion, 462; of the Infancy, 465; of Nicodemus, 465.
GRAMMATICAL INTERPRETATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE ESSENTIAL, 60, 389.
GREEK LANGUAGE, omen of universal religion, 103.
GREEK THOUGHT IN CONTACT WITH JUDAISM (Alexandria), 83.

HAGIOGRAPHA, their character due to captivity, 80.
HEATHEN ALLUSIONS TO AN EXPECTED MESSIAH, 151.
"HEAVEN" SYNONYMOUS WITH "GOD," when first used, 86 *n.*
HEBREWS, Epistle to the, its testimony to the Gospel, 189.
HEGESIPPUS ON INSPIRATION, 412.
HENOCH, Book of, clearness of Messianic doctrine, 117.
HERETICS, their adoption of the several Gospels, 244.
HERMAS ON INSPIRATION, 406.
HIPPOLYTUS ON INSPIRATION, 418.
HISTORY OF HUMAN RACE CENTRES IN THE GOSPEL, 69.
HISTORY OF JEWISH PEOPLE, its importance, 71.

IGNATIUS ON INSPIRATION, 405.
INSPIRATION, different theories of, 30; defined, 34, 39; combines the divine and human, 218; various forms of, 37; proofs of, 43; claimed in the New Testament, 43 *n.*; opinions of the fathers of the first three centuries on, 402, 445.
INTERPRETATION, grammatical and spiritual, 59, 389.
IRENÆUS ON INSPIRATION, 413.

JAMES, St., his testimony to the Gospel, 186.
"JESUS CHRIST," use of title in the Gospels, 296 *n.*
JEWISH THOUGHT, development of, 71; later doctrine of the Messiah, 155; people, affected by the captivity, 75; contrast between Galilee and Judæa, 287; literature, outline of, 108.
JOHN, St. (Baptist), how mentioned by St. Matthew and St. Luke, 351 *n.*
JOHN, St. (Evang.), his character, 302; his life, 242, 255; analysis of Gospel, 280; its poetical conception, 274; language, 264 *n.*, 268 *n.*; style, 268; contrasts to the Synoptists, 254, 284; coincidences with the Synoptists, 291, 295 *n.*; coincidences with St. Paul, 306 *n.*; quotations from the Old Testament, 283 *n.*; adapted by the Valentinians, 249; rejected by the Alogi, 263; his account of the resurrection, 332; his Epistles, their testimony to the Gospel, 189.
JOSEPHUS, rejection of Messianic hope, 150.
JUBILEES, Book of, no reference to the Messiah, 132.
JUDE, St., his testimony to the Gospel, 186.
JUSTIN MARTYR ON INSPIRATION, 408.

KABBALA, its doctrine of Messiah, 156.
KOSMOS, mundus, æon, 50 *n.*; (*ὁ κόσμος*), how used by St. John, 266 *n.* (See World).

LAW, the, statedly read after the captivity, 79 *n.*
"LIFE" (*ἡ ζωή*), how used by St. John, 265 *n.*
"LIGHT" (*τὸ φῶς*), 266 *n.*
LOGOS (see Word), use of term in LXX. and New Testament, 264 *n.*
LORD, our, identity of character in Gospels, 296.
LOST TRIBES, Jewish tradition on, 131, 155.
LUKE, St., analysis of Gospel, 370 *n.*; language of Gospel, 383 *n.*; connected with St. Paul, 195, 239; adapted by the Marcionites, 248; preface, 196,

241 *n.*; his account of the crucifixion, 325; his account of the resurrection, 331.

MANETHO, contemporary with LXX., 96 *n.*

MARK, St., analysis of Gospel, 363 *n.*; language of Gospel, 365; connected with St. Peter, 191, 235; adapted by the Docetæ, 247; his account of the crucifixion, 323; his account of the resurrection, 331.

MARY, V., not mentioned by name in St. John, 292 *n.*

MATTHEW, St., analysis of Gospel, 348 *n.*; language of Gospel, 360 *n.*; history of Gospel, 194 *n.*; Aramaic original of Gospel, 231; quotations from Old Testament, 232 *n.*; adapted by the Ebionites, 245; his account of the crucifixion, 322; his account of the resurrection, 330.

MELITO ON INSPIRATION, 412.

MESSIAH, earlier doctrine developed in Old Testament, 110; later doctrine developed in New Testament, 141; distinguished from the "Word," 162 *n.*; distinguished from Shekinah, Metatron, etc., 159 *n.*; preëxistent, 155 *n.*; suffering, 156 *n.*; dying, 131; character not openly claimed by our Lord, 147 *n.*; usage of Word in New Testament, 147 *n.*

MESSIANIC PROPHECIES, Jewish interpretation of, 168.

MINISTRY OF OUR LORD, its length uncertain, 289 *n.*

MIRACLES, their character, 50; recorded by St. Matthew, 353 *n.*; recorded by St. Mark, 362 *n.*, 367, 472; recorded by St. Luke, 374; recorded by St. John, 283 *n.*; of the Gospels classified, 466.

MISHNA, reference to Messiah, 152.

MYSTICISM OF THE ESSENES, 89; of the Therapeutæ, 100; of the Kabbalists, 156.

NOVATIAN ON INSPIRATION, 417.

OBJECTIONS TO THE GOSPELS, their origin, 387; their uncertainty, 391.

OLD TESTAMENT, history of Canon obscure, 77 *n.*; how quoted in the Gospels, 232, 283 *n.*, 399; its sufficiency in primitive times, 181, 190.

OMISSIONS IN THE GOSPELS, 286.

ORIGEN ON INSPIRATION OF SCRIPTURE, 429; on interpretation of Scripture, 433.

ORPHIC AND SIBYLLINE WRITINGS, 98.

PAGANISM, essentially local, 103.

PARABLES, their character, 51; to whom addressed, 288; recorded by St. Matthew, 356 *n.*; recorded by St. Mark, 362 *n.*, 367, 472; recorded by St. Luke, 375; their analogies in St. John, 290; classified, 469.

PARALLELISM a poetic feature in St. John, 274.

PASSION, our Lord's, Synoptic narratives of, 321.

PASSOVER, last, uncertainty of date, 289 *n.*

PAUL, St., his teaching compared with St. John's, 306 *n.*; his Epistles, their testimony to the Gospel, 187.

PECULIARITIES OF THE GOSPELS, their amount and value, 201.

PETER, St., his name, 202 *n.*, 299 *n.*; his character, 299; his denial, 301 *n.*; his Epistles, their testimony to the Gospel, 186.

PHILO, scope of his teaching, 99; scope of his doctrine of Messiah, 148; scope of his doctrine of the Word, 163.

PHILOSOPHY, its work in preparing for Christianity, 104.

PRAYER developed during the captivity, 78.

PREACHING the first form of Christian doctrine, 177, 179.

PROPHECIES OF MESSIAH, how explained by the Jews, 168; of Old Testament, how quoted in New Testament, 52, 53 *n.*

"PSALMS OF SOLOMON," clear reference to Messiah, 140.

QUOTATIONS of our Lord, 399; of the Evangelists, 53 *n.*, 400; confirm the Hebrew Matthew, 232 *n.*; referred to Messiah, explained by Jews, 168; in St. John's Gospel, 283 *n.*

RESURRECTION predicted in Book of Henoch, 123; of body confined to the righteous in Book of Henoch, 123 *n.*; our Lord's, four narratives of, 327.
ROMAN EMPIRE identical with civilized world, 106; suggestive of a universal religion, 104.

SAMARITAN DOCTRINE OF MESSIAH, 171.
SANHEDRIM, its origin, 79 *n.*
SAYINGS OF OUR LORD, apocryphal, 446.
SECTS, their rise among the Jews, 86; at Corinth, 245 *n.*
SEPTUAGINT VERSION, its history, 96; reference to Messiah doubtful, 134.
SERMON ON THE MOUNT, outline of, 352 *n.*
SHECHINAH, whether applied to Messiah, 159 *n.*, 162 *n.*
SIBYLLINE BOOKS conceive a universal theocracy, 98; their testimony to Messiah, 114.
SIMON MAGUS, the Antichrist of first age, 238.
SIMON THE JUST, his great maxim, 82.
"SON OF GOD," usage of phrase, 145 *n.*
SPIRITUAL INTERPRETATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE, 63.
SYNAGOGUE AND SCHOOLS, their rise, 72, 79.
SYNOPTIC GOSPELS, their agreements, 200; their differences, 205; order of composition, 214 *n.*; contrasted with St. John, 220; unchronological, 343.

TARGUMS, their date, 136 *n.*; their clear reference to Messiah, 135; their clear reference to the Word, 162.
TATIAN ON INSPIRATION, 410.
TEMPTATION OF OUR LORD, accounts of, 316.
TERTULLIAN ON INSPIRATION, 420.
THEOPHILUS ON INSPIRATION, 411.
THERAPEUTÆ, 100.
TITLES OF THE GOSPELS, 218 *n.*; on the Cross, 236 *n.*
"TRADITION OF THE ELDERS," Mishna, Talmud, 88.
TRANSFIGURATION, narratives of, 318.
"TRUTH" (ἡ ἀλήθεια), how used by St. John, 266 *n.*

VERBAL COINCIDENCES BETWEEN THE SYNOPTISTS, 203.

"WISDOM OF SOLOMON," 101.
"WORD," doctrine of the, in Palestine, 161; in Egypt, 163; in St. John, 264 *n.*, 267; not applied to Messiah by Henoch, 126 *n.*; by Targums, 159 *n.*, 162 *n.*; by Philo, 149 *n.*, 166.
WORLD, state of the, at the Advent, 105; ὁ κόσμος, how used by St. John, 266 *n.*

For the Index I am indebted to the kindness of my friend the Rev. J. Frederic Wickenden, M. A., of Trinity College, Cambridge.

The End.

429

Date Due

D 27 '38
AP 20 '48
JE -'48
JE 8-'48
DE 11 '50
FACULTY
FACULTY
SEP 1997
OCT 0 1997
NOV 1997
DEC 18 1997

BS2555.4 .W52 1866
An introduction to the study of the
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00059 1869